Reflexes of Finiteness in Romance

Kim Anouk Groothuis

Christ's College

University of Cambridge

June 2019

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Declaration

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Kim Groothuis, June 2019

Abstract

Reflexes of Finiteness in Romance, Kim Anouk Groothuis

This dissertation investigates the concept of finiteness across Romance, a theoretical notion very frequently used within linguistics although still poorly understood (Ledgeway 2007:335). Various Romance verb forms and clauses which are not readily classifiable as either finite or non-finite are examined, such as personal and inflected infinitives, as well as Balkan-style subjunctives in Romanian, Salentino, and southern Calabrian, morphologically finite verb forms which behave syntactically as non-finite verbs.

First the categorial status of irrealis complements is studied; it is argued that both non-finite (the Romance infinitival complementisers deriving from Latin AD and DE) and irrealis complementisers (southern Calabrian *mu,* Salentino *cu,* Upper southern Italian *che* and Romanian *să*) are spurious categories. Specifically, it is shown that AD, DE, *mu* and *cu* can head variously sized clauses with different degrees of syntactic finiteness and that the morphological form of the verb does not seem to influence the clause size nor the degree of finiteness. Romanian *să*-clauses, on the other hand, are consistently CPs. It is thus concluded that there is no cross-linguistic correlation between finiteness and clause size.

Second, the diachrony of these irrealis complementisers is analysed as well; they all result from a process of downwards (re)grammaticalisation, whereby grammatical elements originating in the C-domain come to occupy the lowest position of the CP, and, in the case of *mu* and *cu*, also come to head smaller complements and thus to occupy lower functional heads. This process is accompanied by a reanalysis from phrase (XP) to head (X) with concomitant phonological reduction.

Third, it is shown that, unlike finite verbs, non-finite and semi-finite verb forms consistently move to a high position within the clause. This is also true of subjunctives; all have a common feature that requires the verb be moved to the edge of the inflectional domain. This movement renders the regular subject position SpecTP unavailable in most of these cases.

The central proposal of the dissertation is that finiteness is not a linguistic primitive, but should be broken down into the anchoring of both Tense and Person. Both allow for different degrees of anchoring to the speech act (independent, dependent, or absent). There is an asymmetrical relationship between the two: only when Tense anchoring takes place, can Person anchoring obtain too. The combination of both anchoring mechanisms yields a scalar view of finiteness that matches more closely the wide range of semi-finite and non-finite forms explored in the dissertation. It is the dependent anchoring which triggers non-finite and semi-finite verbs to move high, while the absence of this anchoring automatically renders reduced complements non-finite. Finally, only when both anchoring mechanisms act completely independently does a fully finite clause obtain.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Adam Ledgeway, without whom this thesis could not have been written. With his vast knowledge about Italian dialects, Romance languages and linguistics, and his endless patience, and willingness to look at a draft of anything I had written, he has helped me more than I can express in a few sentences. He has been an extraordinary mentor, on a professional and personal level, inspiring me with new ideas, encouraging me when I did not feel confident, and by giving me many opportunities to develop further as a scholar and a teacher. I have learned so much, and enjoyed myself a lot along the way: thank you!

I am deeply grateful also to Theresa Biberauer and Norma Schifano, who have been my PhD advisors over the past few years. They have read and given feedback on previous versions of the chapters of the thesis, and the discussions I had with them have been helpful and fun. I also wish to thank Michelle Sheehan, for our enjoyable and inspiring discussions on inflected infinitives. I would also like to thank Roberta D'Alessandro, who first introduced me to linguistics and the wonders of the dialects of Italy. She has been supporting me from my first day from my undergraduate degree, and encouraged me to go to Cambridge.

This thesis would not have been possible without the many intuitions, translations and grammaticality judgments from the following people, who I heartily thank: Alejo Alcaraz, Salvatore Baingiu, Federica Ciardo, Ştefania Costea, Mirella De Sisto, Adina Dragomirescu, Hernan Fernandez Trelles, Alex-Filipe Ferreira-Leites, Libero Iaquinto, Eugenio Iglesias, Ángel Jiménez-Fernández, Mariangela Marulli, Audrey Merlivat, Aurélien Mounier, Alexandru Nicolae, M. Carme Parafita Couto, Iberia Perez, Anna Pineda, Carmine Pintore, Antonio Priore, Afra Pujol i Campeny, Eride Quarta, Januaria Quarta, João Ramalhinho, Norma Schifano, Carla Semedo, Eleonora Serra, Giuseppina Silvestri, Francesco Sponza, M. Olimpia Squillaci, Mimmy Squillaci, Vincenzo Suraci, Albert Ventayol, Giulia Viola, and Stanislao Zompì. Among these, special thanks goes to M. Olimpia, Giusi, Mirella, Ştefania, Alexandru, and Afra who have not just been great informants, but did so much more than just that.

I am very grateful to Guido Mensching, Maurizio Virdis, Eva Remberger, Salvatore Baingiu, Carmine Pintore, and Gloria Turtas, for putting me in contact with family and friends in Sardinia. I would also like to thank everyone whom I interviewed in Sardinia: Mauro Calvisi, Angelo Baingiu, Paola Baronesu, Deiana Battistini, Giovanni Pietro Bellu, Paolo F Berria, Tonino Bussu, Emanuela Calvisi, Mauro Calvisi, Franco Carotti, Luca Cheri, Diego Corraine, Pasquale Corras, Paolo Curreli, Francesca De Serra, Stefano Deledda, Antonietta Fancello, Maria Lucia Fancello,

Alessandro Fele, Maria Forno, Ada Fronteddu, Francesco Fronteddu, Pier Luigi La Croce, Giulio Ladu, Natale Lanna, Maria Lunesu, Lina Manca, Maria Marche, Gaspare Mele, Paolo Mereu, Maria Antonia Mereu, Anna Maria Gesuina Mesina, Rita Moro, Antonio Orrú, Antonimaria Pala, Giuseppina Pala, Andrea Pira, Giuseppe Piras, Mauro Piredda, Antonietta Porcu, Massimiliano Rosa, Carola Rubanu, Pasqualina Sanna, Maria Antonia Sanna, Maria Turtas, and Federica Zanda. Gratzias meda!

My research would not have been possible without the generous scholarships from the Cambridge Trust and AHRC DTP, whom I heartily thank, as well as my college, Christ's College, for supporting my conference trips with grants.

Coming to Cambridge, I found myself surrounded by a group of wonderful Romance linguists: Gigi Andriani, Valentina Colasanti, Alice Corr, Ştefania Costea, Clara Cuonzo, Norma Schifano, Giuseppina Silvestri, and M. Olimpia Squillaci. Thank you all for our inspiring discussions on Romance linguistics, trips to conferences together, the dinners, and great company all around.

Much of this thesis has been written in the graduate centre of the MML faculty, where I have made some friends for life. I would like to thank Eleonora Serra, Afra Pujol i Campeny, Draško Kašćelan, Abhimanyu Sharma, Katerina Pavlidi, Jamie Douglas, Jon Roozenbeek, Tim Laméris, Oliver Mayeux, Curtis Sharma, Rosie Finlinson, Nicolò Morelli, Alice Corr, and M. Olimpia Squillaci for their company over the last few years, as well as visitors such as Beatrice Palazzoni, Vincenzo di Caro, Edoardo Cavirani, and Cora Pots. They have made every day in the office fun with coffees, laughter and the regular pub outings. I would also like to thank Jamie Douglas for his meticulous proofreading of this thesis.

Also outside the grad, I am grateful to many people for their great company: Francesco Sponza, Katie Sloan, Wicher Malten, Hayley Forbes, Dave Johnston, Carla Cao, and Laura Morabito. Thanks also to Giulia Viola, Vincenzo Iaquinto and Marianna Iaquinto, for the weekends in Moiano and all the food sent to Cambridge, which brought a bit of Southern Italy to the UK.

Back in the Netherlands, there are many great friends who have supported me while writing this thesis, as well as hosting me on several occasions. I wish to thank Tessa van Opbergen, Samantha Zohlandt, Selma Hoogzand, Jacqueline Verwer, Mirella De Sisto, Yvette Diamanti-Knteis, Nikky van Triet; thanks also to my friends from school: Leslie Jutbo, Julie Lepot, Isabella Rossen, Lisa van der Hoeven, Laura Baakman, Edmée Kerkhofs, and Jack Goessens. I would also like to thank my colleages of the Italian department in Leiden. It has been wonderful to teach back at my old department.

I would like to thank my family: my parents Siebren Groothuis and Antoinette Vesseur, and my sister Irme, for encouraging me to follow my dreams and tell me to never give up. Their love and support has been invaluable. It is to them that I dedicate this thesis.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the one who has made me smile every single day throughout these last four years: Libero. Thanks to his love, support, and jokes, even the most stressful moments have been bearable. Thank you for providing data from Moianese, for driving me around in Sardinia, and, most of all, thank you for moving to Cambridge for me. *Grazie amò!*

Table of contents

List of tables

List of abbreviations and symbols used

1/2/3	first/second/third person		LAS	lower adverb space
ABL	ablative		LASp.	Latin American Spanish
ACC	accusative		Lat.	Latin
BFr.	Belgian French		LE	(province of) Lecce
BN	(province of) Benevento		LL	late Latin
BrPt.	Brazilian Portuguese		LOC	locative
Cal.	Calabrian		M	masculine
Cat.	Catalan		Nap.	Neapolitan
CE	(province of) Caserta		NEG	negation
CH	(province of) Chieti		NO	(province of) Novara
CL	Classical Latin		NOM	nominative
COND	conditional		NID(s)	northern Italian dialect(s)
Cos.	Cosentino		NOC	non-obligatory control
CS	(province of) Cosenza		NPI	negative polarity item
CZ	(province of) Catanzaro		NU	(province of) Nuoro
DAT	dative		O	Old
DET	determiner		OC	obligatory control
DOM	differential object marking		PART	partitive (clitic)
EC	exhaustive control		PASS	passive
ESID(s)	extreme southern Italian dialect(s)		PC	partial Control
EuPt.	European Portuguese		PL	plural
F	feminine		PLPRF	pluperfect
Fr.	French		PPC	past participle construction
FUT	future		PRET	preterite
Gal.	Galician		PRF	perfect
GEN	genitive		*pro*	silent subject pronoun
GER	gerund		PRO	silent controlled subject
HAS	higher adverb space		PRS	present
It.	Italian		PST	past
IMP	imperative		Pt.	Portuguese
IND	indicative		REFL	reflexive
IPFV	imperfect		Ro.	Romanian
INF	infinitive		RC	(province of) Reggio Calabria

Sal.	Salentino	VCat.	Valencian Catalan
Srd.	Sardinian	Ven.	Venetan
SBJV	subjunctive		
S	nouthern	=	cliticises to
SG	singular	*	ungrammatical
SID(s)	southern Italian dialect(s)	?	marginal
Sp.	Spanish	%	interspeaker variation
SUP	supine	#	grammatical with different
USID(s)	upper southern Italian dialect(s)		interpretation

1. Introduction: traditional views on finiteness and problems in Romance

1. Finiteness

1.1 Traditional definitions

Finiteness has traditionally been defined as a binary morphological property of verbs and/or clauses. Within paradigms we can distinguish finite (inflected) and non-finite (non-inflected) forms. Such a definition is still very much in use, for example, in Matthews' (2007) *Dictionary of Linguistics*, 'finite' is defined as follows:

(1) "Traditionally a verb, e.g. in Latin or Greek, inflected for person and number. Now more generally of any verb whose form is such that it can stand in a simple declarative sentence: e.g. Latin *veni* ('came-1sg') 'I came'; English *came* in *I came* or *was (standing)* as in *He was standing*. Opp. non-finite, infinitive; cf. tensed."

(Matthews 2007)

This definition gives us the traditional morphological property that makes a verb finite: being inflected for person and number. It mentions however how this relates to a syntactic property: only a finite verb can head a matrix (declarative) clause. Similarly, Trask (1993) and Crystal (2008) give the following definitions:

(2) "Denoting a form of a verb or auxiliary which can in principle serve as the only verb form in a sentence and which typically carries the maximum in morphological marking for such categories as tense and agreement permitted in a language."

(Trask 1993:103–4)

(3) "A term used in the grammatical classification of types of verbs and clauses. A finite verb (phrase) is a form that can occur on its own in a finite independent sentence (or main clause); it permits formal contrasts in tense and mood. Non-finite forms of the verb, on the other hand, occur on their own only in dependent clauses, and lack tense and mood contrasts. All forms except the infinitives and participles (-ing and -en forms) are finite, e.g. is walking, have walked, walks. Clauses which contain a finite verb are finite clauses (these in English always contain a subject, except in the case of commands); otherwise, they are non-finite clauses (e.g. walking down the street, to kick the ball)."

(Crystal 2008)

The focus on the presence of inflection is common to all three definitions. This idea of finiteness goes back to the grammatical tradition of Latin and Greek grammarians (Nikolaeva 2007a:1; see also Anderson 2007:26), who divided verbs into *verba finita* and *verba infinita,* where *finitus* has to be interpreted as 'limited'. Finiteness has thus traditionally been seen mainly as a property of the verb, which, in turn, bears consequences for the clause it appears in.

Following this tradition, within the grammars of Romance languages, infinitives, gerunds, and participles are standardly classified as non-finite, whereas the indicative and subjunctive paradigms involve finite verbs. Infinitives, gerunds, and participles typically lack tense marking and person agreement; they do not usually occur in sentences without an inflected (auxiliary) verb. Indicative and subjunctive verb forms, on the other hand, feature tense marking and agree in person and number with their subject, and are therefore regarded as finite.

However, a purely morphological definition is untenable from a cross-linguistic point of view. There are many languages that present very little or no morphological inflection at all in their verbal paradigms, e.g. Chinese, Vietnamese (Klein 2006:246). Also some Indo-European language such as Danish (Vincent 1998:11) or Afrikaans (Donaldson 1993:318) do not have any inflectional person/number marking, which makes distinguishing verbs based on the presence or absence of inflection extremely difficult. The absence of morphological agreement or tense marking does not however mean that these languages do not distinguish between finite and non-finite clauses at a syntactic level.

For instance, in Afrikaans, where the verbal paradigm consists of a base form (e.g. *werk* '(to) work') and a past participle (e.g. *gewerk* 'worked'), finite verbs do not differ morphologically from infinitives. Nevertheless, on a syntactic level, finite clauses differ from infinitival ones in several ways. Consider the following examples:

(4) a. *Vandag* **is** *hy siek*.

today be.3SG he ill

'He is ill today.'

(Afrikaans, Donaldson 1993:362)

b. *Ek* **is** *besig om* *'n brief te skryf.*

I be.1SG busy for a letter to write.INF

'I am busy writing a letter.'

(Afrikaans, Donaldson 1993:272)

(5) a. *Sy* *het* *dit* **kon** **lees**, *ten spyte van die tydsdruk*

she have.3SG this be.able.INF read.INF, in spite of the time.pressure

waaronder sy werk.

under.which   she   work.3SG

'She was able to read this, in spite of the pressure under which she works.'

b. *Sy   kon   dit   seker   **gelees het**,   maar ek is   nie seker of*

She   can.PST.3SG this   certainly read.PTC have.INF, but   I   be.1SG   NEG sure whether

sy   wel   het   nie.

she   indeed   have.3SG NEG

'She could probably have read this, but I am not sure if she did.'

(Afrikaans, Biberauer, p.c.)

In main clauses (and many embedded clauses when the complementiser *dat* 'that' is dropped), finite verbs move to second position (4a); non-finite verbs never undergo this movement and show OV order (4b). Second, as shown in (4b) as well, infinitives are introduced by *(om) te* '(for) to', whereas the finite complementiser is *dat* 'that'. Third, the ordering of verb clusters is sensitive to a distinction within the non-finite domain (5): infinitives always follow their selecting verb, whereas participles precede it.[1] The absence of morphological marking of finiteness thus does not mean that there is no opposition between finite and non-finite form, as illustrated by Afrikaans.

1.2 Problems in Romance

Also within Romance a purely morphological definition of finiteness runs into problems. Many Romance languages boast a series of verb forms that cannot be readily classified as finite or non-finite. For instance, there are many non-finite forms which can bear person/number inflection, such as the inflected infinitives of European Portuguese, Galician, Sardinian and Old Neapolitan (6). Old Neapolitan and some southern European Portuguese varieties allow inflected gerunds as well (7), and Old Neapolitan even has inflected present and past participles (8), although these latter forms were quite rare (Vincent 1996; 1998; Ledgeway 2009a):

(6)   *Será   difícil   eles   aprovar**em**   a proposta.*

be.FUT.3SG difficult they approve.INF.3.PL   the proposal

'It will be difficult for them to approve the proposal.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:86)

(7)   *Li casali   intravano   adimandando**no** pane.*

---

[1] The fact that there can be verb clusters shows that there must be a distinction between finite and non-finite forms, as it is not possible to juxtapose two elements of the same type (a principle adopted from phonology, the Obligatory Contour Principle (Neeleman & Van de Koot 2006)).

[the inhabitants of] the outlying villages   enter.IPFV.3PL demand.GER.3.PL bread

'The inhabitants of the outlying villages came in asking for bread.'

(ONap., *Cronaca di tumulti* 1585; *apud* Vincent 1998:5)

(8)   *In questa   città di Napoli erano   duo mariti   e mugliere timentino Dio.*

       in this   city of Naples be.IPFV.3PL   two husbands and wives   fearing.3.PL God

       'In the city of Naples there were two husbands and wives who feared God.'

(ONap., Loporcaro 1986:194)

These are verb forms that are traditionally regarded as non-finite but which agree with their nominative subject in person and number features overtly – a property which is often used to distinguish between finite and non-finite forms. They will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

By contrast, personal infinitives which do not agree morphologically, but still license a nominative subject (another hallmark of finiteness, in this case syntactic) are found in the majority of Romance languages (cf. chapter 4, and see Ledgeway 2000: ch.3; Mensching 2000). An example is given from Catalan:

(9)   *Menjar ara nosaltres no   seria   mala idea.*

       eat.INF   now we.NOM   NEG be.COND.3SG   bad   idea

       'For us to eat now would not be a bad idea.'

(Cat., Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:399)

The traditional definition of finiteness thus runs into problems both on a morphological and syntactic level.

A third problematic form is the subjunctive as found in Romanian, Salentino and southern Calabrian (henceforth referred to as 'Balkan-style subjunctive'). These verbs are morphologically finite, in that they bear apparent morphological marking for tense, aspect and mood and they agree with their subject. However, on a syntactic level, they pattern with non-finite clauses, in that they do not have deictic (or absolute) tense, as shown in (10). Deictic tenses can be defined as "tenses which take the present moment as their deictic centre" (Comrie 1985:36).

(10) *Am   vrut   să plece   ieri.*

       have.1SG wanted   SA leave.SBJV.3SG   yesterday

       'I wanted him to leave yesterday.'

(Ro.)

Instead, with functional verbs such as modals and aspectuals, the tense is to be interpreted as simultaneous (11a); with lexical control verbs, the embedded tense is future/irrealis (11b), on a par with infinitival complements (Stowell 1982; Bošković 1997):

(11) a. *Ncumencianu/finiscinu   mi (u) mbivinu*
          start.3PL/finish.3PL   MU it=drink.3PL
          'They start/finish drinking it.'

                                                (SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:110)

      b. *Decidia   mi   fazzu   i lestopitti.*
          decide.1SG   MU   make.1SG   the lestopitti
          'I decide to make lestopitti.'

                                                (SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

Furthermore, the subject of a Balkan-style subjunctive can be obligatorily co-referent with an argument of the matrix clause (12), just as the subjects of infinitival clauses in other Romance languages:

(12) *Ion$_i$ ştie   să vorbească   e$_{i/*j}$ engleza.*
       Ion   know.how.3SG SA speak.SBJV.3SG   English
       'Ion knows how to speak English.'

                                                (Ro.)

Thus, the morphologically finite form of the Balkan-style subjunctive shows some syntactic characteristics that are typically associated with non-finite forms.

The syntactic definition according to which only finite forms can head their own clause is also not without problems, as non-finite forms can appear in matrix clauses; for instance, infinitives are used to form the negative imperative in varieties such as Italian, Romanian and Old French (Zanuttini 1997a:chap. 4). Another instance of a non-finite form in a matrix clause is the so-called 'narrative infinitive', where an infinitive acts as a main verb (cf. chapter 5§1.2):

(13) *Marie est   venue et   Jean   de partir.*
       Marie be.3SG   come and   Jean   of leave.INF
       'Marie has come and Jean has left.'

                                                (Fr., Nikolaeva 2007b:153)

There is thus a series of phenomena within Romance which challenge the traditional definition of finiteness as a morphological, binary opposition.

1.3 Research questions

Given that the traditional definition of finiteness turns out to be problematic for Romance, the question arises of how to define finiteness; whether it is a binary distinction (i.e. the traditional view) or rather a scalar phenomenon (cf. chapter 5, as well as Vincent 1998, Ledgeway 1998). The latter view could accommodate problematic forms such as the inflected or personal infinitive as intermediate between 'finite' and 'non-finite'. Another discussion point is whether finiteness is a notion that is purely morphological or also syntactic or semantic, or a combination of these. Certain properties associated typically with finiteness are morphological (e.g. presence of inflection), others syntactic (licensing of a nominative subject). If we need to distinguish between these levels of grammar, is finiteness actually a linguistic primitive (Vincent 1998; Adger 2007)? Or is it the result of a combination of syntactic features, such as the ability to assign nominative Case, the position of subjects and the temporal evaluation of the verb (Ledgeway 1998)? In short, the notion of finiteness is "surrounded by controversy" (Nikolaeva 2010:1176), and, "although standardly recognized by linguists of many diverse theoretical persuasions, finiteness continues to figure among one of the most poorly understood concepts of linguistic theory" (Ledgeway 2007:335).

The main research question of this dissertation thus focuses on the nature of finiteness as emerging from data from Romance languages. How do intermediate forms, such as the inflected and personal infinitive, or the Balkan-style subjunctive, fit in a finite – non-finite continuum? What are its reflexes of finiteness at a (morpho)syntactic level? It could be hypothesised that finiteness correlates with the presence or absence of functional structure in a clause, or that it is reflected in properties such as verb movement. Does a non-finite clause correspond to a reduced structure? Is there a difference in the movement of finite verbs and non-finite verbs? A related question focuses on the diachrony of finiteness: can finiteness change? We see the replacement of non-finite forms with (modally marked) finite forms in Romanian, Salentino and southern Calabrian. At first glance, it seems that these complements become more finite, as the subjunctive has morphological marking for tense and agreement, which an infinitive does not have. Does this replacement of the infinitive by a subjunctive also have consequences for finiteness on a syntactic level? Furthermore, this replacement raises questions about the relation between mood and finiteness. Are modally marked forms such as the subjunctive less finite than indicative forms? The present dissertation aims to provide answers to these research questions by closely investigating non-finite clauses, focusing particularly on the problematic cases of the Balkan-style subjunctive and the inflected and personal infinitives. Other constructions, such as pseudo-

coordination (Ledgeway 1997; Ledgeway 2016a; Andriani 2017:chap. 5; Di Caro 2018) and imperatives have been excluded for limitations of time and space but are definitely worth investigating with respect to finiteness. This will be left for future research.

2. Theoretical assumptions

This dissertation is couched in a hybrid Minimalist and cartographic framework. The cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997; Cinque 1999; Rizzi 2004; Cinque & Rizzi 2015) aims to draw specific maps of functional structure "as precise and as detailed as possible" (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:66). The guiding heuristic principle is the maxim of "one (morphosyntactic) property – one feature – one head" (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:74). Each projection is thus not only based on empirical data in terms of orderings of morphemes and functional elements, but is also semantically motivated; there are thus no semantically vacuous heads such Agreement heads (Rizzi 2004:6). Following the strongest hypothesis based on the Uniformity Principle (Chomsky 2001), which assumes languages to be uniform unless there is evidence to the contrary, it is assumed that the sequence of functional heads is universal and that they are always projected in every language. The order of these functional heads is partly determined through semantics (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:77).

One of the first domains to be split according to the new cartographic approach was the CP. Rizzi (1997) originally proposed the extended complementiser domain as in (14). In later research, a few additional projections have been posited, yielding (15):

(14)   [Force [Top∗ [Foc [Top∗ [Fin [IP …]]]]]]]]]]

(Rizzi 1997:297)

(15)   [Force [Top∗ [Int [Top∗ [Foc [Top∗ [Mod [Top∗ [Fin [IP …]]]]]]]]]]]

(Rizzi & Bocci 2017:8)

In a similar manner, the I-domain is split up in a series of functional heads (Cinque 1999). Cinque notes that adverbs tend to occur in the same order cross-linguistically, as well as functional verbs. He assumes the following clausal spine, whereby adverbs lexicalise the specifier positions of specific functional heads (16). These functional heads can be realised by the verbs in (17):

(16)   [**frankly** Mood$_{\text{speech act}}$ [**fortunately** Mood$_{\text{evaluative}}$ [**allegedly** Mood$_{\text{evidential}}$ [**probably** Mod$_{\text{epistemic}}$ [**once** T(Past) [**then** T(Future) [**perhaps** Mood$_{\text{irrealis}}$ [**necessarily** Mod$_{\text{necessity}}$ [**possibly** Mod$_{\text{possibility}}$ [**usually** Asp$_{\text{habitual}}$ [**again** Asp$_{\text{repetitive(I)}}$ [**often** Asp$_{\text{frequentative(I)}}$

[**intentionally** Mod$_{volitional}$ [**quickly** Asp$_{celerative(1)}$ [**already** T(Anterior) [**no longer** Asp$_{terminative}$ [**still** Asp$_{continuative}$ [**always** AsP$_{perfect(?)}$ [**just** Asp$_{retrospective}$ [**soon** Asp$_{proximative}$ [**briefly** Asp$_{durative}$ [**characteristically**? Asp$_{generic/progressive}$ [**almost** Asp$_{prospective}$ [**completely** AspSg$_{Completive(I)}$ [**tutto** AspP1$_{Completive}$ [**well** Voice [**fast/early** Asp$_{celerative(II)}$) [**again** Asp$_{repetitive(II)}$ [often Asp$_{frequentative(II)}$ [**completely** AspSg$_{Completive(II)}$

(Cinque 1999:106)

(17) [Mod$_{Epistemic/Alethic}$ **dovere/potere** [Asp$_{Habitual}$ **solere** [Asp$_{Predispositional}$ **tendere** [AspRepetitive **tornare** [Mod$_{Volition}$ **volere** [Asp$_{Terminative}$ **smettere** [Asp$_{Continuative(I)}$ **continuare** [Asp$_{Durative/Progressive}$ **stare** [Mod$_{Obligation/Ability}$ **dovere/potere** [Asp$_{Frustrative/Success}$ **riuscire** [Mod$_{Permission}$ **potere** [Asp$_{Conative}$ **provare** [Causative **fare** [Asp$_{Inceptive}$ **cominciare** [Asp$_{Andative}$ **andare** [Asp$_{Completive}$ **finire** [v-VP V...

(Ledgeway & Roberts forthcoming)

In this thesis, cartography is adopted because it allows us to have a more precise idea of verb-movement and the amount of functional structure present in different types of non-finite clauses. These are less clearly recognisable in less articulated (minimalist) structures with only the core functional categories C, T, and *v*.

From Minimalism, the concept of phases will be adopted when classifying certain clause types. Phases are the domains to which certain operations are restricted due to locality conditions (Gallego 2010:39). The complement of a phase head becomes inaccessible to outside operations as soon as the following phase head is merged (modulo the details depending on the version of the Phase Impenetrability Condition which is adopted (cf. Chomsky 2000; 2001)); only the phase head and its edge remain visible. As will become clear in chapters 2 and 5, the same clause size and the same amount of functional structure (and thus phase heads) do not always translate into the same degree of finiteness and transparency of a clause. This is where the distinction between non-phasal and phasal complements, as well as defective phases, comes in. When a phase (head) is defective, its complement is still accessible to outside operations even when the phase head is merged. An example of a defective phase, discussed in chapter 5, is a subjunctive complement (Gallego 2010:163), because they show various transparency effects (cf. e.g. Meireles & Raposo 1983; Picallo 1984a; Progovac 1993) and lead to "domain extension" (Kempchinsky 1987).

Another notion that will be adopted from Minimalist approaches is that of feature inheritance. According to Chomsky (2004), ϕ-features, i.e. person, number, and gender, originate on the phase heads, e.g. C, but can then be shared with or donated to lower functional heads, e.g. T (cf. also Ouali 2008). The features relevant to the morphological expression of finiteness can be located both on the C-head and the T-related heads, which can be accounted for through this mechanism.

It is often thought that the richness of cartographic derivations is contrary to Minimalist goals, which generally only assume the core categories C, T, *v*. However, these are two different approaches, focusing on different elements of grammar: whereas Minimalism studies the general mechanisms guiding the derivation, cartography focuses on the precise subparts of the derivation, resulting in a "fruitful division of labour" (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:73). Chomsky (2000:143 fn.31) himself states explicitly that the core functional categories C, T, *v* (in the clausal domain) and D (in the nominal domain) assumed in the Minimalist tradition are "surrogates for richer systems". In this dissertation, therefore, the cartographic approach will be adopted whenever trying to establish the precise location of elements within the derivation, but this will be combined with general Minimalist ideas about clause derivation and finiteness on a broader level.

3. Methodology

The data studied in the present thesis have been collected in a range of ways. For many languages, questionnaires have been formed with a grammaticality-judgment task, e.g. French, Spanish, European Portuguese, Catalan, Italian, northern Italian varieties (Venetian), and southern Italian varieties (Airolano and Moianese, two closely related dialects in the province of Benevento, Campania, as well as Verbicarese, spoken in the province of Cosenza, Calabria). Wherever possible, interviews based on the questionnaires have been conducted in person, to avoid any misunderstandings, and in case of verb movement, to make sure speakers judged the sentences with a neutral, flat intonation (cf. Schifano 2018:3–4). Otherwise, they have been filled out digitally. Extensive interviews have also been carried out with speakers of Romanian, Calabrian and Salentino. The Sardinian data proved more difficult to collect online, as the inflected infinitive is less used nowadays. Mostly older speakers in remote villages tend to use the form. Given these sociolinguistic factors, I undertook a short fieldwork trip to collect more data for the inflected and personal infinitives in the province of Nuoro in April 2018.

In both cases, speakers were asked to judge sentences choosing between 1 'correct, I would say this', 2 'I do not use this, but I have heard people say it' or 3 'incorrect, nobody would say this'. When studying verb movement, speakers were also asked to pick the most 'natural' word order between the various options they had been given to judge, though there was not always a strong preference for one order over another. The data collected via questionnaires and/or interviews have always been compared to and integrated with those found in the literature.

4. Overview of the thesis

The present dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter 2 analyses the structural position of the irrealis subordinators in various Romance languages, specifically *che* in upper southern Italian dialects (henceforth, USIDs), Romanian *să*, southern Calabrian *mu/ma/mi* and Salentino *cu*. As will be shown, the complements introduced by these elements can be more or less finite. The main question is whether the different levels of finiteness correspond to different structural sizes of the complement. It will be shown that no such one-to-one relationship between the dimension of the clause and its degree of finiteness exists cross-linguistically.

Subsequently, chapter 3 studies the diachrony of the same irrealis subordinators. None of these was originally used as such, and in the case of Romanian *să*, Salentino *cu* and southern Calabrian *mu/mi/ma,* their emergence correlates with a replacement of a morphologically non-finite verb form (viz. the infinitive) with a morphologically apparently finite form (viz. the subjunctive). The diachrony of the irrealis complementisers is thus closely connected to the diachrony of morphosyntactic finiteness. For some of these subordinators, the etymology is widely accepted; for others, such as *mu*, there is disagreement in the literature. I will argue that both *cu* and *mu* derive from Lat. QUOMODO 'how'. This chapter shows furthermore that all these irrealis markers are a result of downwards grammaticalisation and therefore present a challenge for many current theories, such as the one put forward by Roberts & Roussou (2003).

Chapter 4 aims to trace and analyse verb movement in various types of non-finite and semi-finite clauses in Romance, including infinitives with specified subjects, inflected infinitives, bare infinitival clauses, Aux-to-Comp (cf. Rizzi 1982), past participial clauses, and the Romanian supine. It will be shown that despite apparent exceptions in French and Romanian, non-finite and semi-finite verbs across Romance generally move very high in the clause. This high position can be explained by their need to be anchored to another clause. The movement renders the canonical preverbal subject position inaccessible in many cases.

On the basis of the findings of the previous chapters, chapter 5 will define finiteness from the Romance perspective. I will review previous approaches to the notion of finiteness, including typological, functional, and generative approaches. It will be argued that finiteness is not a linguistic primitive, despite the proposal of functional projections like Rizzi's (1997) FinP, but instead should be related to the anchoring of the event to the utterance through both Tense and Person. The relation between mood and finiteness will also be (briefly) discussed. Chapter 6 will conclude the thesis with the answers to the research questions set out in §1.3 and the implications of the new definition of finiteness and the analyses proposed in this dissertation.

2. Functional structure and finiteness

1. Introduction

Many historical and modern Romance varieties are characterised by the presence of a dual (or multiple) complementiser system, in which one of the two (or in some cases three) complementisers marks *irrealis* mood. Irrealis modality refers to events that have not (yet) taken place, and irrealis complements are neither presupposed nor asserted (unlike factive[1] or realis complements (Hooper & Thompson 1973; Palmer 1986:1)). Examples of irrealis complementisers are Romanian *să* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994:93-111; Alboiu & Motapanyane 2000), southern Italo-Romance *che/chi* (Rohlfs 1969:190-193; Ledgeway 2000:70-75; 2003; 2005; 2006; 2009b; 2012a:170; 2016b) and the Balkan-style complementisers *cu* in Salentino and *mi/mu/ma* in Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian varieties (Sorrento 1951; Rohlfs 1969:190-193; 1983; Calabrese 1992; 1993; Ledgeway 1998; 2013; 2015a; Damonte 2011; De Angelis 2013; 2015). Furthermore, we find *ocche/cocche* introducing a subset of irrealis clauses, namely jussive and optative clauses, in Abruzzese and Molisano varieties (D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010). In Romanian, Salentino, southern Calabrian and northeastern Sicilian, the complements introduced by these irrealis subordinators replace many uses of the canonical Romance infinitive and subjunctive. We can expect therefore that these clauses instantiate different degrees of finiteness. They indeed obligatorily show subject coreference and simultaneity in some cases, and future/irrealis and free subjects in others (C-subjunctives and F-subjunctives respectively, in Landau's (2004:827) terms). The former group is thus less finite than the latter. In upper southern Italian dialects (henceforth USIDs), *che* introduces clauses that are typically regarded as finite; they exist alongside infinitival complements, with which they are usually (but not always) in complementary distribution.

      This chapter will analyse the structural position of these irrealis subordinators in USIDs, Romanian, southern Calabrian and Salentino, showing that they do not represent a unified phenomenon but rather a spurious category. Some of them, namely southern Calabrian *mu* and Salentino *cu*, appear in different positions along the clausal spine, on a par with the infinitival complementisers A(D) and DE (Ledgeway 2012b; 2015a:157; 2013:fn.6; 2016b:1014–5; Taylor 2014; Squillaci 2016:160–2). The main question is whether the different levels of finiteness correspond to different structural sizes of the complement. It will be shown that no such one-to-

---

[1] Factive complements are left aside for most of the discussion in this chapter, as they generally do not select *cu, mu,* or *să* in the varieties under discussion.

one relationship between the dimension of the clause and its degree of finiteness holds crosslinguistically.

2. USID *ca* vs *che* distinction

Many USIDs present a dual complementiser system with an opposition between *ca*[2] and *che* (Rohlfs 1969; Ledgeway 2000:70-75; 2003; 2005; 2006; 2009b; 2012a:170; 2016b):

(1) a. *Ji cregə   **ca** tu   no stasə   buənə.*
       I   believe.1SG that you.SG NEG stay.2SG   good
       'I believe you are mad.'

   b. *Libero   vulwera   **cchə** Ccarmela   vənerədə   a Bbrəvəcarə.*
      Libero   want.COND.3SG that   Carmela   come.COND.3SG to Verbicaro
      'Libero wants Carmela to come to Verbicaro.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

According to Rohlfs (1969: 190) there is a split between declarative and epistemic verbs on the one hand and verbs of wishing or intention on the other, due to language contact with Greek, as schematised in Table 1; the first class selects the realis complementiser *ca*, the second class selects an irrealis complementiser (*che/chi*). These two complementisers are sometimes referred to as the indicative and subjunctive complementisers, but *che* does not invariably select subjunctive verbs (Ledgeway 2003; Ledgeway 2005; Ledgeway 2006). Furthermore, in many of these varieties, the present subjunctive morphology has been lost, often substituted by either the present indicative or imperfect subjunctive (Rohlfs 1969:61–3; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014).

Table 2.1 Dual complementiser systems in southern Italy (Rohlfs 1969: 190/Ledgeway 2006:114)

Italian	*penso **che** verrà*	*voglio **che** lui mangi*
	'I think **that** he will come'	'I want **that** he should eat'
Sicily	*pensu **ca** vèni*	*vògghiu **chi** mmanciassi*
Sicily (prov. of Messina)	*critu **ca** vèni*	*ògghiu **mi** mancia*
southern Calabria	*pensu **ca** vèni*	*vogghiu **mu (mi)** mangia*
northern Calabria	*criju **ca** vèni*	*vuogliu **chi** mmangia*
Salento	*crisciu **ca** vène*	*ogghiu **cu** mmancia*

[2] The complementiser *ca* is also attested in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese (Herman 1963: 150ff.; Corr 2016). A homophonous comparative complementiser *ca* (< QUAM) is attested in many Italian dialects (Herman 1963:152; Väänänen 1963:163; Rohlfs 1968:86).

Naples	*pènsə **ca** vènə*	*vòglìə **chə** mmangə*
northern Apulia	*pènsə **ca** vènə*	*vògghìə **chə** mmangə*
Abruzzo	*pènsə **ca** vènə*	*vòjjə **chə** mmangə*

Note that Rohlfs classifies southern Calabrian *mu* and Salentino *cu* clauses in the same group as the *che/chi* complements of other southern varieties. Here, we will follow Ledgeway (2003, 2005, 2009) and Manzini & Savoia (2011:52) in distinguishing the two, mainly because the *ca/chi* distinction can co-occur with *mu,* as in the Calabrian dialect of Arena. The Balkan-type complementation pattern of the extreme southern dialects will be discussed in §3.

USIDs feature a greater use of finite complementation than other 'standard' Romance varieties (Ledgeway 2000:ch.3). Finite clauses do not only occur in non-control complements, but also in obligatory control (OC) contexts:

(2) a.   *Ciro prummette   che   nun   se mbriaca.*
      Ciro promise.3SG that   NEG   REFL=get.drunk.3SG
      'Ciro promises that he will not get drunk.'

    b.   *Ciro crere   ca   canosce   a Mmario.*
      Ciro believe.3SG   that   know.3SG   DOM Mario
      'Ciro believes that he knows Mario.'

<div align="right">(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:68)</div>

However, as we will see, the infinitive is still very much used in these varieties. This is another major difference with the Balkan-style subjunctive found in ESIDs discussed below.

2.1 Abruzzese *ocche*

Some eastern Abruzzese dialects present an apparent third complementiser in addition to the *ca* vs. *che* distinction: *ocche* (and its negative counterpart *nocche*), which is used in (negative) jussive and optative clauses (D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010). *Ocche* derives from a shortened form of *vò* < VOLET '(s)he wants' + *che* < QUID (Rohlfs 1969: 182-3). D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010) convincingly show that *ocche* is to be analysed as a T-element rather than as a traditional complementiser, since it can co-occur with an overt lexicalisation of both Force and Fin (3). It follows overt lexical subjects (3) and it follows negation (4). Finally, it is in complementary distribution with auxiliaries.

(3) *So   ditte **ca**,   si ni funzione la machine, **ca**   Gianne **ocche** le porte   a lu*

be.1SG said ca_force if not work.3SG the car ca_fin Gianni ocche it=take.3SG to the *meccaniche.*

mechanic

'I said that, if the car won't work, Gianni should take it to the mechanic.'

<div align="right">(Abruzzese, D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010:2052)</div>

(4) ***Nocche*** *li dice si nni li vo' dice*

NEG=ocche it=say.3SG if not it=want.3SG say.INF

'May he not say it if he doesn't want to!'

<div align="right">(Abruzzese, D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010:2056)</div>

As it consistently lexicalises a T-head, it will not be discussed further in the rest of this chapter.

3. Balkan-type complementation

3.1 Extreme southern Italian dialects

The Romance varieties spoken in Salento, southern Calabria, and northeastern Sicily, collectively known as *Magna Graecia*, all belong to the extreme southern Italian dialects (ESIDs) historically strongly influenced by Greek. These varieties also present a split between irrealis and realis complements, where the irrealis subordinating particle replaces the canonical Romance infinitive to a large extent.[3] In fact, these varieties present a restricted use of the infinitive (cf. Rohlfs 1969). Examples of the irrealis subordinating particles are given in (5)-(7):

(5) *Lu Karlu ole* **ku** *bbene krai.*

the Karlu want.3SG CU come.3SG tomorrow

'Karlu wants to come tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1993:28)</div>

(6) [voɐɟu **mu** lu 'vijju]

want.1SG MU him=see.1SG

'I want to see him.'

<div align="right">(SCal., San Pietro a Maida (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005:656)</div>

(7) *Vogghiu* **mi** *veni.*

---

[3] Even if the USIDs also present a relatively restricted use of the infinitive in comparison to standard Italian (cf. Ledgeway 2000: 67ff.).

want.1SG   MI come.3SG

'I want him/her to come.'

<div align="right">(Sic., Messina, Leone 1995:68)</div>

These same particles can also function as complementisers introducing purpose clauses.

The emergence of these finite complementation strategies at the expense of the infinitive must undoubtedly be linked to intensive language contact with the Greek spoken in the region (Rohlfs 1972; Squillaci 2016). Indeed, they represent the classic example of the Rohlfsian slogan "*materia romanza, spirito greco*", inasmuch as the syntax of complementation follows the Greek PAT(tern), while the lexemes marking these specific complements derive from Latin/Romance lexical MAT(erial) (Matras & Sakel 2007:829–30). Nonetheless, there is much variation between and within southern Calabrian, Sicilian and Salentino in the distribution of the finite and infinitival complementation patterns.

In Salento, the unpopularity of the infinitive has not affected all Salentino dialects to an equal degree. We can in fact distinguish three main groups on the basis of the use of *cu*. In the first group, formed by the northernmost Salentino dialects, the infinitive is regularly used in complement clauses; these dialects do not feature irrealis clauses introduced by *cu* (Mancarella 1998:287). It is indeed to the south of the isogloss Taranto – Ostuni where the construction with *cu* is found. The second group is formed by the northern Salentino dialects of the Brindisino type and some central-southern Salentino dialects, in which verbs expressing volition, desire and similar meanings tend to select *cu* followed by a verb in the subjunctive or indicative:

(8) a. *Voğğu   ku pparlu.*

     want.1SG CU speak.1SG

     'I want to speak.'

   b. *Lu mannáu   ku gguárda.*

     him=send.PRET.1SG   CU look.3SG

     'I sent him to look.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Mancarella 1998:187)</div>

In the last group, the southern Salentino dialects, we find the construction with *cu* used even more extensively, since it is extended to other complements such as complements of modal and causative verbs:

(9) a. *M-a   ffattu ku kkapsiku.*

     me=have.3SG   made CU understand.1SG

'S/he made me understand.'

b. *No ssape   ku kkunta.*

NEG know.3SG   CU count.3SG

'S/he does not know how to count.'

(Sal., Mancarella 1998:187)

Also in Calabria, there is variation with regards to the complementation patterns attested. It is in the southern part of Calabria that we find the constructions with *mu,* south of the line Nicastro – Tiriolo – Marcellinara – Catanzaro – Sersale – Cervà – Petronà – Mesoraca – Cutro – Botricello (Rohlfs 1969:102; Pristerà 1987:140). Within Calabria, there are different morphological variants of the particle. Apart from *mu*, we find *ma* in Catanzaro and its immediate surroundings and *mi* in most parts of the province of Reggio Calabria (Rohlfs 1969; Sorrento 1951). In some dialects, *mu* and *mi* can be reduced to '*u* and '*i*.[4]

Finally, in Sicily, *mi*-clauses are only found in the northeastern part of the island, in the province of Messina. It is in this part of the island that the Greek substrate survived the longest (Leone 1995:67). In the standard description by Rohlfs (1969:102) the three outer points of this triangular area are formed by Naso, Toarmina and Messina, but in subsequent research, the isogloss has been extended at the eastern side to Cerami (EN) (Leone 1995:69). Unlike in Calabrian, we do not find any reduced forms of *mi* or allomorphic variants in Sicilian varieties (De Angelis 2015:8). On the whole, the phenomenon is less extended than in Calabrian and Salentino, both diatopically and structurally (De Angelis 2013:25).

In all three varieties, the embedded verb is typically in the present indicative, as the subjunctive has been mostly lost in SIDs, especially the present subjunctive forms (cf. Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014, a.o.). The embedded verb is always indicative in southern Calabrian and Sicilian[5] (Sorrento 1951:387; Ledgeway 1998:34; Roberts & Roussou 2003:92). However, in some Salentino dialects *cu* can be followed by a verb in either the indicative or subjunctive (Rohlfs 1969:103). This is dependent on whether the dialect still has a morphological subjunctive form. A specific dialect might have a morphological subjunctive only for the third person, auxiliaries or frequently used lexical verbs (Bertocci & Damonte 2007) according to the implication hierarchy in (10):

---

[4] Rohlfs (1969:193) describes this as phonological reduction in spoken language but Damonte (2009) and Chillà & Citraro (2012) argue that the reduced form and the full form have a different distribution, which is determined by the presence or absence of object clitics.

[5] In Sicily, the jussive use of *mi* presents another exception as in these clauses *mi* combines with the imperfect subjunctive, yielding an imperative interpretation. However, these main clause uses of *mi* will be left aside here.

(10) 3 {sg > pl} > 1/2 {sg > pl} / Auxiliary {BE > HAVE} > Lexical {irregular > regular (non- first conjugation > first-conjugation)}

<div align="right">(Ledgeway 2015b:117)</div>

This hierarchy is to be read as meaning that whenever a dialect presents a morphological subjunctive for one of these verb types, it also has a morphological subjunctive for the verb types to its left. This hierarchy correlates with areal distribution. Whereas northernmost and southernmost dialects do not have any morphological subjunctive form, central dialects do (Mancarella 1998:184; Bertocci & Damonte 2007:7).

Although Balkan-style subjunctive markers in Salentino, southern Calabrian and northeastern Sicilian are very similar, there are some distributional differences. The (im)possibility of combining with C-elements constitutes a major difference between Salentino on the one hand and Calabrian and Messinese on the other. Salentino *cu* cannot combine with *ca* (11) or *wh*-elements (12):

(11) a. *Ulia   ka   ku bbeɲɲu.*
          want.IMPF.1SG that   CU come.1SG
          'I wanted to come.'

      b. *Ulia   ka   la Maria ku bbene.*
          want.IMPF.1SG that   the Mary CU come.3SG
          'I wanted Mary to come.'

      c. *Sperava   ka ku   bbeɲɲu.*
          hope.IMPF.3SG that CU   come.1SG
          'S/he hoped that I would come.'

      d. *Sperava   ka   la Maria ku bbene.*
          hope.IMPF.3SG that   the Mary CU come.3SG
          'S/he hoped that Mary would come.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992:279)</div>

(12) a. *Me sta   ddumannu ntʃe   ku addʒu   fare.*
          me=stay.1SG   ask.1SG   what CU have.1SG   do.INF
          'I am asking myself what I should do.'

      b. *Me sta   ddumannu addu   ku addʒu   ʃire.*
          me=stay.1SG   ask.1SG   where   CU have.1SG go.INF
          'I am asking myself where I should go.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992:279)</div>

On the other hand, *mu* can co-occur with C-elements. It can be preceded by a finite complementiser *chi* or *ca*, which leads to the combinations *chimmu* and *cammu*:

(13)   a. *Chimmu ti viu   riccu contentu*
         that=MU you=see.1SG   rich happy
         'May I see you rich and happy.'
       b. *Chinnommu   cadi   mai   malatu!*
         that=NEG.MU   fall.3SG ever ill
         'May he never fall ill.'

                                        (SCal., Roberts & Roussou 2003:91)

In these examples, the matrix complementiser *chi* marks the clause as optative, lexicalising the Force head. Calabrian *mu* can also combine with other elements to form complex expressions, such as *pe* 'to', which expresses purpose, to form *pemmu* or *pemmi* (14):

(14)   *Vonnu   pe mi vindu.*
        want.3PL for=MU come.1SG
        'They want me to come.'

                                        (SCal., RC, Rohlfs 1969:193)

Pe can also be combined with the negative counterpart of *mu*, viz. *nommu*, yielding *pe non mu,* as shown in the following examples (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 659):

(15)   [mi nda 'jivi   pɛ nnɔ mmu   ti 'viju]
        me=of.there=go.PRET.1SG   for NEG MU   you=see.1SG
        'I left in order not to see you.'

                                     (SCal., Davoli (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005:659)

In addition, *mu* can follow the interrogative complementiser *si* 'if' or *wh*-elements:

(16)   *Non   sacciu   si mma vegnu   o   menu.*
        NEG   know.1SG   if MU   come.1SG   or less
        'I do not know if I should come or not.'

                                        (SCal., Ledgeway 1998:30)

(17)   *Non   sacciu   chimmu   dico.*
        NEG   know.1SG   what=MU   say.1SG

'I do not know what to say.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Locri (CZ), Damonte 2009:232)</div>

Another major difference is the relative order of negation and the subordinator. The position of negation differs between Salentino on the one hand, and southern Calabrian and Sicilian on the other. In Salentino, negation occurs between *cu* and the embedded verb:

(18) a. [n'd addʒu   'tittu ku   nu (ɲtʃi) ɛnɛ].
         to.him=have.1SG   said   CU   NEG (LOC)=come.3SG
         'I told him not to come there.'
      b. [ɛtɛ   mejju ku   nu b'bɛne].
         be.3SG   better CU   NEG come.3SG
         'It is better for him not to come.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Carmiano (LE), Manzini & Savoia 2005:660)</div>

Instead, negation generally precedes both *mu* and the verb in southern Calabrian,[6] as in the examples below:

(19) [suɲɲu kun'tɛntu   nɔ mu   u 'viju].
      be.1SG happy   NEG MU   him=I.see
      'I am happy that I do not see him.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Gizzeria (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005:659)</div>

(20) [ti ðissi   nɔ mmu lu 'cami].
      to.you=say.PRET.1SG   NEG MU   him=call.2SG
      'I told you not to call him.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Iacurso (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005:659)</div>

---

[6] In some dialects, however, we find the Salentino pattern where negation follows the particle *mu*.

(i) a. [tɛ 'diku   mu ur u 'cami]
         to.you=say.1SG MU NEG him=call.2SG
         'I told you not to call him.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Conflenti (CZ), (Manzini & Savoia 2005:660)</div>

     b. [suɲɲu kun'tiəntu mu uŋ 'bɛnanu]
         be.1SG happy   MU NEG   come.3PL
         'I am happy they are not coming.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Platania (CZ), (Manzini & Savoia 2005:660)</div>

Calabrian *non* is always in a position preceding the subordinator *mu*, and can never be separated from it. There are a series of possible explanations. It might be that negation moves and incorporates onto *mi* (Damonte 2008). Another explanation can be found by assuming a Neg position within the CP (Roberts & Roussou 2003:91), but as argued by Squillaci (2016:162–63), this would be purely stipulative as there is no further evidence for a negative head within the CP. Instead, I will assume here that *nommi* is simply the negative version of the subordinator, modelled on the Greek *μή* (cf. also Latin *ut* and *ne,* and Basque negative complementisers as discussed by Laka (1992)).

3.2 Romanian *să*

Romanian presents a complementiser system that is typical of the Balkan Sprachbund, as it features both an indicative complementiser (*că*) and a subordinating particle *să*. This particle marks the subjunctive, which, with the exception of the verb *a fi* 'be', presents forms distinct from the indicative only in the 3rd person. A subjunctive form can normally not appear without this modal particle. However, in 16th-century Romanian there are cases of bare subjunctives, albeit limited to 3rd person optatives and imperatives (Sandfeld & Olsen 1962:354; Hill 2013:555; Zafiu et al. 2016:16). The absence of *să* in modern Romanian is still grammatical in optative clauses, when the subject is 3rd person:

(21) *Ducă-se   pe pustii!*
       lead.SBJV.3SG.=REFL   on desert
       'May it/s/he go to hell!'

(Ro., Zafiu 2013a:45)

(22) *Fie   cum zici   tu!*
       be.SBJV.3SG how say.2SG   you.SG.NOM
       'Be it as you say!'

(Ro., Nicolae 2017:4)

Să, like the subordinating particles of the other Balkan languages, has a puzzling nature. While it behaves on the one hand as a modal particle related to the I-domain, it can also act as a conjunction, introducing complement clauses (23b) or final clauses (23c), in opposition with the indicative complementiser *că* (23a):

(23) a. *Cred   că   Ion nu a   venit la petrecere.*
           believe.1SG that   Ion NEG have.3SG   come to party
           'I believe that Ion has not come to the party.'

    b. *Vreau   să merg   la petrecere.*

       want.1SG   SA go.SBJV.1SG   to party

       'I want to go to the party.'

    c. *Merg   să-l   aduc   pe   doctor.*

       go.1SG   SA=him fetch.SBJV.1SG DOM   doctor

       'I go to fetch the doctor.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

Să thus has a dual character. On the one hand it can act as a complementiser and on the other it functions as the subjunctive marker and as such it can occur with other complementisers, as in the following examples where a left-peripheral element precedes the verbal complex and the subordinate clause is then introduced by *ca .. să*:

(24) a. *Vreau   ca ION   să meargă   la petrecere.*

       want.1SG   that Ion SA go.SBJV.3SG   to party

       'I want Ion to go to the party.'

    b. *Vreau   ca   MÂINE   să ne vedem,   nu   azi.*

       want.1SG   that   tomorrow SA us=see.1PL NEG   today

       'I want us to see each other tomorrow, not today.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

Like other Balkan languages, as well as Salentino and Calabrian, Romanian uses the infinitive very rarely in complement clauses. Its use has mostly been replaced by subjunctive clauses headed by *să* (Sandfeld 1930; Rosetti 1962; Joseph 1983; Rivero & Ralli 2001; Tomić 2006). The goal of this chapter is to compare the Romance varieties with irrealis complementisers in terms of their structural position. Their diachrony will be the subject of chapter 3.

3.3 Differences between USIDs and Balkan-style complementation

Although both oppositions seem broadly similar, a distinction needs to be drawn between the irrealis complementiser *che/chi* type in opposition to a realis *ca,* as found in USIDs, on the one hand, and subordinating particles such as *să, cu* and *mu* on the other (Ledgeway 2003; Ledgeway 2006; Ledgeway 2009b; Manzini & Savoia 2011:51ff.), as the systems can co-occur. This is the case, for instance, in the Calabrian variety spoken in Arena (VV), which employs *mu* for control and raising verbs, but also presents the two distinct complementisers *ca* and *chi* (Manzini & Savoia 2011:51–2). Furthermore, *chi* (the irrealis complementiser, in opposition with the

indicative/realis complementiser *ca*) can combine with *mu* in many southern Calabrian varieties (see (13))*.* Similarly, *să* appears with the complementiser *ca* (unlike *că*) whenever there is material preceding the subordinating particle (as in (24) above). This is however not the case for Salentino *cu*, which, at least in modern varieties, cannot combine with *ca* (cf. (11) above). From this perspective, *cu* therefore seems more similar to *che*. However, as will be shown in the next section, the structural position of all four irrealis markers (*che, cu, mu/ma/mi* and *să*) groups *cu* and *mu* together, whereas *să* appears in the same position as *che*.

4.   Structural position of irrealis subordinators and complement sizes

4.1 Previous analyses of the position of irrealis complementisers

There is an ongoing debate in the literature about the exact structural position of particles such as *să, mu,* and *cu.* The debate has its origins in the fact that these particles seem to have a dual character (or 'spurious nature', cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Paoli 2003), which makes them similar to a complementiser, located in the C-domain, but at the same time recalls modal particles belonging to the I-domain. The earliest GB approaches to this problematic nature can be grouped according to whether the particle is located in the IP or the C-domain or both. Among these three particles, the position of *să* is the most studied.

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) argues that *să* is located in C but adjacent to I which leads to feature indexation and consequently the restructuring incorporation of the two heads, which explains the hybrid nature of *să*. The absence of a subject position between *să* and the inflected verb is the result of this restructuring incorporation. Her arguments for locating *să* in C are that the absence of *să* triggers inversion (I-to-C), the fact that *să* precedes clitics (which constitute a boundary with CP), its invariable nature (unlike I-elements), and the fact that *să* can head an embedded clause. Problematic, however, is that *să* can co-occur with other complementisers such as *ca*, because both would have to appear in C (which is coindexed with I). Furthermore, the restructuring incorporation of I and C cannot account for the occurrence of clitic pronouns, negation and clitic adverbs (*mai* 'still', *prea* 'that much', *şi* 'also', *cam* 'a bit' and *tot* 'repeatedly') between *să* and the verb. It also predicts, contrary to fact, that *să* cannot occur with auxiliaries and modals, which are located in I.

On the other hand, Rivero (1994) gives an unified account of the Balkan modal particles, placing them in MoodP (MP) (now often equated with FinP within Rizzi's (1997) split CP), the highest of the functional heads of the I-domain. This view is adopted by Paoli (2003), Alboiu (2006), Jordan (2009), and Giurgea (2011). Barbosa (1995) proposes a similar account where *să* heads a phrase XP above TP. This account has the advantage that it explains why *să* is not in

complementary distribution with other complementisers (24), but it cannot explain why it can also head a subordinate clause that appears in argument positions, as in (23c).

Adopting a split CP (Rizzi 1997), there are, at least, two possible complementiser positions, namely Fin and Force. Fin is the lowest head of the complementiser domain, which encodes information on finiteness and modality and connects the complementiser domain to the inflectional domain. Therefore, FinP seems a very suitable candidate for these particles with properties related to both the complementiser and inflectional domains. Indeed, FinP has been proposed by various scholars (Stan 2007; Nicolae 2015; Gheorghe et al. 2016). Force can be lexicalised by *ca* or *că*, of which the first one appears whenever the topic-focus field is activated in a *să*-clause. Within this second group of approaches, we need to distinguish the proposal put forward by Hill (2013), who splits the FinP in two positions, *fin1* and *fin2*, where the former encodes finiteness and the latter modality.

With regard to Salentino *cu* and Calabrian *mu,* the two are usually analysed as occupying different positions. This would explain some distributional differences between the two: *cu* never co-occurs with other complementisers or *wh*-words and precedes negation, whereas *mu/mi/ma* does combine with C-elements and follows negation. This has often been explained by arguing that *cu* occupies a higher position, arguably in the C-domain, than *mu/ma/mi,* which would be in the T-domain (see e.g. Ledgeway 1998; Damonte 2011). As with Romanian *să,* this cannot account for the fact that these elements can head purpose clauses. It also incorrectly predicts that no modal or auxiliary can co-occur with *cu* or *mu*.

Finally, in the case of the double complementiser system in USIDs, the generally accepted view, advocated principally by Ledgeway (2003; 2005; 2006; 2016b) [7], is that, at least underlyingly, the realis complementiser lexicalises Force, whereas the irrealis complementiser occurs in Fin. The realis complementiser is thus expected to precede any left-peripheral element, whereas the irrealis complementiser follows (Ledgeway 2016b:1018–1019). However, the picture is complicated by the fact that many varieties have nowadays generalised one of the two forms, although they continue to mark the difference syntactically through a difference in position of the complementiser with respect to topics and foci (Rohlfs 1983; Ledgeway 2009b; Ledgeway 2016b:1019; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014). In older varieties, the distribution was different, as *che* was generalised as a Force complementiser heading both irrealis and propositional complements, and *ca* introduced propositional complements only in the absence of material in the left periphery (Ledgeway 2003; 2005; 2006; cf. chapter 3§4).

---

[7] But see also Poletto (2001), Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005), and D'Alessandro & Ledgeway (2010) for similar proposals in Italian.

4.2 Irrealis complementisers lexicalising different positions

A radically different approach to the dual nature of these irrealis complementisers is arguing that they can occupy different positions along the clausal spine: a position within the verbal domain (*v*P), the inflectional domain (IP) or the complementiser domain (CP), depending on the matrix verb that selects them (Ledgeway 2012b; 2013:n. 6; 2015a:157; Taylor 2014; Squillaci 2016:160–2). This makes them more comparable to the infinitival complementisers *a/à* and *di/de* in Italian and French respectively (cf. Kayne 1999; Cinque 2004:165; Tortora 2014; Ledgeway 2016b:1014–5), which can introduce complements of various sizes, as exemplified for Italian in (25):

(25) a. *Dichiarò*   [*CP* *di* [*IP*   *essersi* [*vP*   *innamorato]]].*
         declare.PRET.3SG   of   be.INF=REFL fallen.in.love
         'He declared that he had fallen in love.'

     b. *Cercai*   [*IP* *di non* [*vP* *sbagliare   strada]].*
         try.PRET.1SG   of NEG   err.INF   street
         'I tried not to take the wrong road.'

     c. *Lo finimmo*   [*vP**di mangiare].*
         it=finish.PRET.1PL   of eat.INF
         'We finished eating it.'

                                                                          (It.)

Infinitives do not instantiate one structure: their structure depends on the matrix verb. When selected by a control verb such as *dichiarare* 'to declare', the complement is a CP (cf. Landau 2015:12, 17ff., a.o.; *pace* Bošković 1997:chap.2, who argues that control verbs select TPs); with restructuring verbs such as *cercare di* 'to try' or *finire di* 'to finish' the complement is reduced. The infinitival complementiser is always the same, but it can lexicalise different positions. Infinitival clauses can therefore be considered a 'spurious' category or even 'acategorial' (cf. Taylor 2014). We can expect similar behaviour for *mu, cu* and *să* since they appear where the infinitive would appear in other Romance languages, and thus hypothesise the same possible complement sizes for the Balkan-style subjunctives:

(26) a. *Speramu [*CP* armenu u focu   nomm'u   ddumanu   stasira].*
         wish.1PL   at.least   the fire   NEG=MU=it light.3PL   tonight
         'Let's hope that they don't light the bonfire at least tonight.'

                                                                (SCal., Squillaci 2016:157)

     b. *Cercu   sempri [*IP*   nommi   fumu].*

      try.1SG   always   NEG=MU smoke.1SG

      'I always try not to smoke.'

c. *Finiscinu*   [*vP* *m'u mbivinu*].

      it=finish.3PL MU=it drink.3PL

      'They finish drinking it.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

In a similar manner, it has also been claimed that Serbo-Croatian *da* can occupy three different positions to encode finiteness in C-, T- and *v*-domains (Todorović & Wurmbrand 2016). Embedded *da*-clauses can be divided into three groups based on their tense properties, which is correlated with their structural size. Tenseless complements are typically selected by restructuring predicates and consist solely of a *v*P, irrealis future complements are formed of a TP/ModP, and propositional complements are CPs. Serbo-Croatian features the replacement of the infinitive with a finite complementiser as in the other Balkan languages, but unlike the other members of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, this complementiser is the same as the one used with epistemic and declarative verbs (Joseph 1983:149; Rivero & Ralli 2001; Tomić 2006).

Therefore, the hypothesis that will be tested in this chapter is that *che*[8]*, să, mu* and *cu* lexicalise a head in the *v*-domain when subcategorised by root modals and lower aspectual predicates, whereas they encode a T-related head when subcategorised by epistemic/alethic modals, temporal and higher aspectual predicates, and that, finally, *che, să*, *mu* and *cu* lexicalise a C-related head when subcategorised by lexical control predicates:

(27) [Mod$_{Epistemic/Alethic}$ **dovere/potere** 'must/can' [Asp$_{Habitual}$ **solere** 'to be in the habit of' [Asp$_{Predispositional}$ **tendere** 'to tend' [AspRepetitive **tornare** 'to keep' [Mod$_{Volition}$ **volere** 'to want' [Asp$_{Terminative}$ **smettere** 'to stop' [Asp$_{Continuative(I)}$ **continuare** 'to continue' [Asp$_{Durative/Progressive}$ **stare** 'to be' [Mod$_{Obligation/Ability}$ **dovere/potere** 'must/can' [Asp$_{Frustrative/Success}$ **riuscire** 'to succeed' [Mod$_{Permission}$ **potere** 'may' [Asp$_{Conative}$ **provare** 'to try' [Causative **fare** 'make' [Asp$_{Inceptive}$ **cominciare** 'to start' [Asp$_{Andative}$ **andare** [Asp$_{Completive}$ **finire** 'to finish' [v-VP V...

<div align="right">(Ledgeway & Roberts forthcoming)</div>

Three matrix verbs will be used for testing complement sizes for each variety (USIDs, Salentino, Calabrese and Romanian): 'can', 'to finish' and 'to decide'. The first two are functional verbs: one

---

[8] Many upper southern Italian dialects feature an irrealis complementiser. With functional predicates such as *finire* and *potere*, however, the infinitive is the only option. Where possible, both the finite and the non-finite complement of *decide* will be taken into account.

high in the hierarchy in (27) and one lower. We therefore expect the aspectual to take a smaller complement than the modal. Finally, the lexical control verb 'to decide' is a control verb for which we hypothesise that it selects a full clausal complement (CP).

In the remainder of this chapter, we will test the complement size of these three classes of verbs with various diagnostics, comparing the behaviour of *cu, mu, che* and *să.* Diagnostics include the tense properties; the possibility of licensing perfective aspect in the embedded clause; the possibility of clitic climbing; the possibility of independent negation of the embedded clause; the possibility of NPIs in the embedded clause being licensed by matrix negation; the presence of *wh*-elements; the possible adverbs in the embedded clause; the presence of an embedded left periphery; compatibility with tough-movement; and finally, the possibility of *wh*-extraction and fronting of the complement clause. In §6, the position of the subject with respect to the subordinating particle will be examined.

5. Structural tests

5.1 Tense and aspect

Complement clauses divide into different types based on their tense properties. These tense properties correlate with the structural size of the embedded clause, as well as the features on the C-head of the embedded clause. The first type of complement clause is tenseless (or anaphoric), typically reduced (infinitival) complements selected by modals or aspectuals. In this case, the embedded verb is necessarily interpreted as being simultaneous with the event of the verb selecting it:

(28) a. *Ieri   potevo   partire   (*domani).*
         yesterday   can.IPFV.1SG   leave.INF tomorrow
         'Yesterday I could leave (*tomorrow).'
      b. *Ieri   iniziai   a studiare (*domani).*
         yesterday   start.PRET.1SG to study.INF tomorrow
         'Yesterday I started studying (*tomorrow).'

(It.)

The events denoted by the infinitives in (28) can only be interpreted as simultaneous to the verb selecting them. Other reduced (IP) complements which are necessarily interpreted as simultaneous to the matrix verb include ECM and raising constructions (Stowell 1982; Bošković 1997).

When the complement consists of a full CP, there are two possibilities for the tense of the embedded clause: a verb can select for a propositional complement or for an irrealis complement. In the first case, the embedded clause has deictic tense, which is totally independent from the matrix clause:

(29) a. *Libero disse   che Mirella era   andata/andava/sarebbe   andata*
    Libero say.PRET.3SG that Mirella be.IMPF.3SG gone/go.IMPF.3SG/be.COND.3SG gone
    in Olanda.
    in Holland
    'Libero said that Mirella had gone/went/would go to Holland.'
   b. *Libero   disse   di andare/essere   andato   in Olanda.*
    Libero   say.PRET.3SG   of go.INF/be.INF   gone   in Holland
    'Libero said he would go/had gone to Holland.'

(It.)

Instead, when a verb selects for an irrealis complement, typically control verbs, the complement is interpreted as future-oriented and unrealised at the moment expressed by the tense of the matrix verb (cf. Stowell 1982):

(30) a. *Eleonora decide   di leggere   un romanzo   domani.*
    Eleonora decide.3SG of read.INF   a novel   tomorrow
    'Eleonora decides to read a novel tomorrow.'
   b. **Eleonora   decide   di leggere/aver   letto un romanzo ieri.*
    Eleonora   decide.3SG   of read.INF/have.INF   read a novel   yesterday
    'Eleonora decides to read a novel yesterday.'

(It.)

This same contrast is observable in the following examples, where only the verbs selecting for deictic tense (and the complementiser *ca,* (31a)), but not the ones selecting for anaphoric tense (and the complementiser *che,* (31b)), can feature a deictic tense such as the preterite:

(31) a. *Saccio   / aggiu saputo   / sapeva   / sapette   [ca*
    know.1SG   / have.1SG known / knew.IPFV.1SG/ know.PRET.1SG   that
    ve verette   a   vuje].
    you.PL=see.PRET.3SG   DOM   you.PL
     'I know/have learnt/knew/learnt that he saw you.'

b. **Voglio   / aggiu   vuluto   / vuleva   / vulette   [che ve*

    want.1SG/ have.1SG wanted / want.IPFV.1SG /want.PRET.1SG   that you.PL=

    verette   a   vuje].

    he.saw.PRET   DOM   you.PL

    'I want/wanted that he saw you.'

<div align="right">(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:71)</div>

In Romance, very broadly speaking, anaphoric tense typically corresponds to subjunctive complements, whereas complements with deictic tense are typically indicative.[9]

In Verbicarese, a USID spoken in the province of Cosenza[10], we see a similar contrast between the functional verbs *fanì* and *putwí,* whose complements need to be simultaneous to the matrix event (32ab). On the other hand, a control verb as *decide* selects a complement that is located in the future with respect to the matrix verb, independently of whether the complement is infinitival (32c) or finite (32d):

(32) a. **Ijərə   ajə   pututə jì   a Nnapələ   krajə.*

        yesterday   have.1SG could   go.INF to Naples   tomorrow

        'Yesterday I could go to Naples tomorrow.'

    b. **Ijərə   ajə   fənitə   i leggə   krajə.*

        yesterday   have.1SG finished of read.INF tomorrow

        'Yesterday I have finished reading tomorrow.'

    c. *ijərə   m'ajə   cumbwinda i jì   a Nnapələ   krajə.*

        yesterday   REFL=have.1SG convinced   of go.INF to Naples tomorrow

        'Yesterday I have decided to go to Naples tomorrow.'

    d. *Maria s'a   cumbwinda cchə Vvitə   adda   jjì   a Nnapələ   krajə.*

        Maria REFL=have.3SG convinced that Vito   have.to.3SG go.INF to Naples   tomorrow

        'Maria has decided that Vito has to go to Naples tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

This shows us the complement of *decide* has to have a CP; the others may be reduced.

In addition, we can use the grammaticality of perfective auxiliaries as a test, as only complements that include the functional head Aspect/TP can include a perfective auxiliary. If the

---

[9] There are many exceptions to this broad generalisation, e.g. the verb *credere* 'believe' in Italian, which selects deictic subjunctive complements.

[10] Verbicaro is located in the *Zwischenzone* of the Lausberg area (Lausberg 1939; Loporcaro & Silvestri 2011).

complement is the size of a *v*P, the Aspect head is not projected and the perfective auxiliary should not be grammatical. The complement to the functional verbs cannot contain a perfective auxiliary:

(33) a. **Po   non aví   capitə.*
        be.able.3SG NEG have.INF   understood
        'He can not have understood.'
      b. **Finisc   i aví   fattə i purpuettə.*
        finish.3SG   of have.INF   made the meatballs
        'I finish having made the meatballs.'
      c. **Vitə sə pensa   cchə avivəmə   finitə   krajə.*
        Vito REFL=think.3SG   that   have.1PL   finished tomorrow
        'Vito expects us to have finished tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

The aspect properties do not show us a difference between the two functional verbs on the one hand and the lexical control verb *decide* on the other, as they select for a simultaneous and irrealis complement, respectively.

Applying these tests to Romanian, we immediately note that the verb in a subjunctive complement in Romanian is always morphologically marked for present tense; imperfective forms are ruled out. This is a 'fake' tense, as the interpretation is not necessarily present. There exists a perfect subjunctive, which however marks perfective aspect rather than tense. This is purely a morphological constraint, however, and it is not representative of the syntactic or semantic tense of the clause, which can still be tested by inserting a temporal adverb in the embedded clause:

(34) a. **Astăzi   pot   să plec   mâine.*
        today   be.able.1SG SA leave.SBJV.1SG   tomorrow
        'Today I can leave tomorrow.'
      b. **Am   început să învăţ   româna   mâine.*
        have.1SG begun   SA learn.SBJV.1SG Romanian   tomorrow
        'I have started studying Romanian tomorrow.'
      c. *Am   decis   să plecăm   mâine.*
        have.1SG decided   SA leave.SBJV.1SG   tomorrow
        'We have decided to leave tomorrow.'
      d. *Mi-a   spus să plec   mâine.*
        to.me=have.3SG   told   SA leave.SBJV.1SG tomorrow

'S/he told me to leave tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

As expected, (34) show that the complements of modals and aspectuals do not have independent tense as the embedded event needs to be simultaneous to the matrix event. Future-oriented verbs such as the ones in (34c,d) on the other hand, allow for a different tense interpretation of the embedded clause, as it can appear with the adverb *mâine* 'tomorrow' whereas the matrix verb is in the past tense. There is thus a difference in the tense properties of the complement to modal and aspectual verbs on the one hand and control verbs on the other. This indicates that the latter contain CPs, whereas the complement to modals and aspectual verbs are reduced.

This conclusion is however not entirely confirmed by the distribution of perfective auxiliaries. In Romanian, only a *să*-complement to an aspectual verb cannot embed a perfective auxiliary:

(35)   a.   **Încep/termin/continui   să nu   fi   înțeles.*
             start.1SG/finish.1SG/continue.1SG SA NEG   be.INF   understood
             'I start/finish/continue not having understood.'

       b.   *Pot   să nu fi   înțeles.*
             be.able.1SG SA NEG be.INF   understood
             'I can not have understood/It is possible I did not understand.'

       c.   *Dacă ai   văzut filmul,   nu se poate   să nu fi   rămas   impresionat.*
             if   have.2SG seen film.DET   NEG REFL=be.able.3SG SA not be.INF remained impressed
             'If you have seen the film, you cannot not be impressed.'

       d.   *Ion se așteaptă   de la noi   să fi   rezolvat problema   până mâine.*
             Ion REFL=expect.3SG from at us   SA be.INF resolved problem.DET   until tomorrow
              'Ion expects us to have solved the problem by tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

The auxiliary is not available with aspectual verbs, but this could be due as much to semantic incompatibility as to the absence of the Aspect head. The grammaticality of an auxiliary in the complement to the modal and lexical control verbs shows that the Aspect head is present in these complements.

As in Romanian, in southern Calabrian and Northeastern Sicilian, the complement contains a verb that is morphologically marked as present tense. [11] The sequence-of-tense rule (*consecutio temporum*), which normally applies to Romance, is thus not respected in this type of complement clause (Lombardi 1998:618):

(36) a. *Passai   senza   mi ti viju.*
          pass.PRET.2SG   without MU you=see.1SG
          'You passed without me seeing you.'
      b. *Volia   pe mi   si spusa.*
          want.IPFV.3SG for=MU   REFL=marry.3SG
          'He wanted to get married.'
      c. *Non   facìa   autru ca   mi ciangi.*
          NEG   do.IPFV.3SG other than MU cry.3SG
          'S/he did nothing but cry.'

                                                              (SCal., Roberts & Roussou 2003:92)

However, this does not mean that *syntactic/semantic* tense is always present/coreferential. In fact, in southern Calabrian/Bovese, with verbs of necessity and volition, the embedded clause can contain a perfective auxiliary (Squillaci 2016:142-3):

(37) *Voliva   megghiu m'eranu   venutu   oji.*
      want.IPFV.1SG better   MU be.IPFV.3PL arrived today
      'I would have preferred if they had arrived today.'

                                              (SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:142)

(38) **Vinneru   mi eranu   ballatu   ajeri.*
      come.PRET.3PL MU be.IPF.3PL   danced   yesterday
      'They came so that they had danced yesterday.'

---

[11] There are however some exceptions to this generalisation in both Calabria and Sicily: in the dialect of Gizzeria, and S. Marco d'Alunzio (ME), we also find verb forms in the imperfect (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 652):

(i) [vɔlia   mu u camava]
     want.IPFV.1SG   MU him=call.IPFV.3SG
     'I wanted that he called him.'

                                              (SCal., Gizzeria (CZ), (Manzini & Savoia 2005:664)

(ii) [tɪ ɾɪssɪ   m ʊ faˈʃɛvɪ]
      to.you=said.PRET.1SG   MU it=do.IPFV.2SG
      'I told you to do it.'

                                      (SCal., S. Marco d'Alunzio (ME), (Manzini & Savoia 2005:665)

These varieties arguably belong to transitional areas, cf. chap.3§3.5.7

This shows that at least these *mu*-complements project the aspectual heads in their functional structure. The ungrammaticality of perfective auxiliaries in control verbs can be explained by semantic constraints due to their necessary interpretation as 'unrealised future'. The ungrammaticality of perfective auxiliaries with modal verbs could be explained if we assume that these complements are reduced.

Also in Salentino, the embedded verb has the morphological present tense form, independently of the tense of the matrix clause:

(39) a. *Oyyu   la Maria   ku bbae   ddai mprima.*
        want.1SG the Maria   CU come.3SG   there before
        'I want Maria to go there before.'

    b. **Ulia   la Maria ku ʃʃiu   ddai mprima.*
        want.IPFV.1SG   the Maria CU go.PST.3SG there before
        'I wanted Maria to go there before.'

The present perfect may however be used to signal aspectual differences. The perfect indicates that the action has been completed at the reference time, which is provided by the matrix predicate, whereas an embedded verb in the present tense indicates that the two events expressed by the matrix and the embedded verb are taking place at the same time. This is exemplified in the Salentino sentence in (40):

(40) *Ulia   la Maria   ku bbae/ia   ʃʃiuta ddai mprima*.
     want.IPFV.1SG   the Maria   CU go.3SG/have.3SG   gone there before
     'I wanted Maria to go/have gone there before.'

In Salentino, perfective aspect is impossible with modals in general:

(41) **Putia   ire   fattu ste   cose l'autru   giurnu.*
     can.IPFV.3SG have.INF done these things the=other   day
     'He could have done these things the other day.'

Perfective auxiliaries are thus only possible in complements to lexical control verbs. This test differentiates the functional from the lexical complements in Salentino.

5.2 Clitic climbing

Clitic climbing is a frequently-used test for restructuring (Rizzi 1982; Cinque 2004). Nevertheless, it might not be a decisive test for restructuring as the absence of clitic climbing does not necessarily imply the absence of restructuring (Cinque 2004:150; Cinque 2006). However, if clitic climbing occurs, in Italian this means that restructuring has taken place, because other restructuring-related phenomena necessarily apply, such as auxiliary switch (Rizzi 1982:21):[12]

(42) *Ho   dovuto   / Sono   dovuta   andarci.*
      have.1SG had.to   / be.1SG had.to.FSG   go.INF=LOC

(43) *Ci sono   dovuta   /*ho   dovuto   andare.*
      LOC= be.1SG had.to.FSG   / have.1SG   had.to   go.INF
      'I had to go there.'

(It.)

We will therefore assume that the possibility of clitic climbing corresponds to a reduced complement, but its absence does not necessarily indicate that the complement is *not* reduced.

In Verbicarese, clitic climbing is only possible with functional verbs, such as *potere* and *finire* (44); with the latter one, it is however not obligatory, as it is with *potere*. The lexical verb *decider*e never allows clitic climbing out of its complement, independently of whether this is a finite or non-finite complement (45):

(44) a. *U puozzə   leggə. /   *puozzə u leggə.*
          it=can.1SG   read.INF/ can.1SG it=read.INF
          'I can read it.'
      b. *U finiscə   i   leggə.   /?finiscə   d'u leggə.*
          it=finish.1SG   of read.INF /finish.1SG of it=read.INF
          'I finish reading it.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

(45) a. *Mə cumvingə   d'u leggə   /   *m'u cumvingə   i leggə.*

---

[12] Although Cinque (2006:29–30) admits that also in these cases 'the evidence of the obligatoriness of clitic climbing is less solid than it appears.'

        REFL=convince.1SG   of=it=read.INF/   REFL=it=convince.1SG   of read.INF

        'I decide to read it.'

b. *Mə cumvingə   cch'u leggə.   / *m'u cumvingə   cchə lleggə.*

        REFL=convince.1SG   that it= read.1SG /   REFL=it=convince.1SG   that read.1SG

        'I decide to read it.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

We can therefore conclude from the impossibility of clitic climbing that *dəcidə* selects a CP-sized complement; whereas the verbs *fənì* (optionally)[13] and *putwí* select reduced complements and hence allow clitic climbing.

    At first glance, the impossibility of clitic climbing does not seem to differentiate between complement types in Romanian. According to prescriptive grammars, it is always blocked by the presence of *să,* independently of the verb selecting the subjunctive (see (46) and (47)). The phenomenon itself is not absent from the language, as it is obligatory with infinitival complements to *a putea* 'to be able' (48)(49):

(46) a. *Pot   să îl   citesc*

        can.1SG SA=it read.SBJV.1SG

      b. **Îl pot   să citesc.*

        it=can.1SG   SA read.SBJV.1SG

        'I can read it.'

(Ro., Nicolae 2016:17)

(47) a. *Maria încearcă să o   scrie.*

        Maria try.3SG   SA=it write.SBJV.3SG

      b. **Maria   o încearcă   să scrie*

        Maria   it=try.3SG   SA write.SBJV.3SG

        'Maria tries to write it.'

(Ro., Terzi 1996:277)

(48) a. *Îl poți   citi.*

        it=can.2SG   read.INF

      b. **Poți   îl citi.*

        can.2SG   it=read.INF

---

[13] It is not immediately clear why clitic climbing would be optional with *finì.* When the clitic is left below, the complement has a slight 'future'-interpetation (Silvestri, p.c.).

'You can read it.'

(49) a. *Se poate   citi   aici.*
  REFL= can.3SG read.INF here

  b. **Poate   se citi   aici.*
  can.3SG REFL=read.INF here

  'It can be read here.'

Clitic climbing does not prove helpful to establish the structural size of subjunctive clauses in Romanian. However, Ledgeway (2016c) reports various examples from colloquial Romanian, where clitics can climb out of an embedded clause (often involving multiple spell-out with the clitic also realised in the embedded clause), when it is selected by functional (50) but, crucially, not by lexical verbs (51):

(50) a. *Pe care   o vrei   să citeşti?*
  DOM which it=want.2SG SA read.SBJV.2SG

  'Which do you want to read?'

  b. *Le e   teamă că   o vreau   s-o abandonez.*
  to.them be.3SG fear   that her=want.1SG SA=her leave.SBJV.1SG

  'They are afraid that I want to leave her.'

  c. *Îi continui   să mănânci.*
  them=continue.2SG   SA eat.SBJV.2SG

  'You continue to eat them.'

  d. *Inima   aproape îi încetează   să bată.*
  heart.DET   almost   him=stop.3SG SA beat.SBJV.3SG

  'His heart almost stopped beating.'

(51) a. *A refuzat(*-o)   să o citească.*
  has refused(=it)   SA it=read.SBJV.3SG

  'S/he have.3SG refused to read it.'

  b. *(*Ne-) a   promis   să ne sune   mai târziu.*[14]

---

[14] This example would be grammatical if the *ne* 'to us' was interpreted as an argument of the main verb.

to.us=have.3SG promised   SA=us calls.SBJV   more late

'S/he has promised to call us later.'

c. *Unii   dintre   admiratorii lor   (*le) sperau   să le vadă   impreună.*

some among   admirers   them.GEN them=hope.IMPF.3PL SA=them see.SBJV.3SG together

'Some of their admirers hoped to see them together.'

<div align="right">(Ro., Ledgeway 2016c:8)</div>

This test shows that there is a difference between the complements selected by functional verbs and by lexical verbs. Only the former ones can show restructuring effects.

Even if clitic climbing might not be the right diagnostic for complement size, the fact that the preverbal clitic position is grammatical in all types of *să*-complements indicates the presence of a functional layer that can host these clitics. Usually, the preverbal clitic position in Romance is located within the I-domain. An alternative analysis here would be the clitic position in the *v*-domain (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005). In Romanian, we can tease these two apart by forming a sentence with *să* with both an accusative feminine clitic *o* 'her, it', which can appear in postverbal position, and a higher clitic, appearing in the I-domain:

(52) a. *Puteam   să-i   fi   zis-o   lui Ion.*

be.able.IPFV.1SG   SA=to.him   be.INF   said=it   DAT Ion

'I could have said it to Ion.'

b. *Aş   vrea să(-o) fi   înţeles(-o).*

AUX.COND.1SG   want.INF SA be.INF understood=it

'I would like to have understood it.'

c. *Aş   vrea   să-i(-o)   fi zis(-o)   lui Ion.*

AUX.COND.1SG   want.INF SA=to.him   be.INF said=it   DAT Ion

'I would like to have said it to Ion.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

When these two clitics co-occur, only the dative clitic appears preverbally, whereas the accusative clitic appears postverbally. This latter position is usually analysed as a VP-related position (Ledgeway 2016c). The fact that both the IP-related and the *v*P-related clitics can co-occur in their normal positions shows that the complements feature the I-domain and *v*P-domain, even when they are selected by a modal.

For southern Calabrian it is also generally reported that clitic climbing is not possible out of a subjunctive complement as it is blocked by *mu*:

(53) *(*U) ncumencianu/finiscinu mi mbivinu*

(it=) start.3PL/finish.3PL MU it=drink.3PL

'They start/finish drinking it.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:106)</div>

However, as in Romanian, in Bovese, reduplication of the clitic in the matrix clause, even though it is an argument of the embedded clause, is possible with functional verbs, but crucially not with lexical control verbs:

(54) a. *(U) provu   m'u   fazzu.*
      it=try.1SG   MU=it do.1SG

    b*. (U) pozzu   m'u   fazzu.*
      it=can.1SG   MU=it do.1SG

    c. **(U) decidu   m'u   fazzu.*
      it=decide.1SG   MU=it do.1SG

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(55) *?u ncumencianu/finiscinu   m'u mbivinu.*
    (it=)start.3PL   /finish.3PL   MU=it=drink.3PL

    'They start drinking it.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:105–6)</div>

Similar examples involving clitic reduplication in the matrix clause are reported for other varieties:

(56) a. *u   poi   m(i)   u cami.*
      him=can.2SG   MU   him=call.2SG

      'You can call him.'

<div align="right">(SCal., S. Agata del Bianco (RC), Manzini & Savoia 2011:III: 388)</div>

    b. *A vuliva   mi s-a   vendi.*
      it want.IMPF.3SG   MU REFL=it   sell.3SG

      'S/he wanted to sell it.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Mèlito di Porto Salvo (RC), De Angelis 2017:11)</div>

This shows that in varieties such as Bovese, in some complements, *mu* does not block clitic climbing. This is only the case for restructuring verbs or aspectuals, but not control verbs such as *decidia* 'I decide', which according to our hypothesis, select a full clausal complement. Like

Romanian, the (im)possibility of clitic doubling in the matrix clause divides the *mu*-complements into two groups.

Finally, in Salentino, clitic climbing is generally not allowed out of *cu*-clauses. However, in the Northern Salentino dialects, in case of *cu*-drop, cliting climbing does occur. In southern Salentino dialects, on the other hand, it never does (Ledgeway 2015: 149).

(57) a. *Lu voli ssapi.*
           it=want.3SG know.3SG
           'He wants to know it.'

                                                    (Sal., Mesagne (BR), Ledgeway 2015: 149)

      b. *(*lu) ole   llu sape.*
           it=want.3SG it=know.3SG
           'S/he wants to know it.'

                                                    (Sal., Martino (LE), Ledgeway 2015: 149)

This leads Ledgeway (2012, 2015) to argue for two different analyses of *cu*-drop: in case of the central-southern Salentino dialects, there is a silent *cu* (viz. *CU*) underlyingly, whereas in northern Salentino dialects the whole CP-layer is absent. In this latter case there is no C-head blocking clitic climbing, resulting in the obligatory climbing of the clitic to the matrix verb. However, when there is a silent *CU,* clitic climbing is blocked by the presence of a C-head (albeit phonologically empty). Crucially, in the northern Salentino varieties, *cu*-drop (and thus clitic climbing) can only occur when there is coreferentiality between the two subjects, and it is especially frequent with the verb *volere* 'to want' (Ledgeway 2012b:467):

(58) a. *Ce   bbuei   (cu)   ddici?*
           what want.2SG CU   say.2SG
           'What do you want to say?'

      b. *Ce   bbuei   *(cu) ddicu?*
           what want.2SG CU   say.1SG
           'What do you want me to say?'

                                            (Sal., Cellino San Marco (BR), Ledgeway 2012b:461)

These are reduced complements lacking the CP-layer (cf. Italian *volere* which can be a restructuring verb), so, in Salentino as well, clitic climbing sets apart *cu*-clauses following functional verbs from *cu*-clauses selected by lexical control verbs.

In conclusion, although the absence of clitic climbing does not provide any conclusive evidence about the status of the complement, the possibility of clitic climbing indicates a reduced

complement. In Salentino, Romanian, and southern Calabrian, clitic climbing (/doubling) is indeed only allowed with functional verbs, and never with lexical verbs, which is in line with our hypothesis that these complements are not full CPs.

5.3 Independent negation

The possibility of independent negation of the embedded clause can be used as a test for the size of the complement clause. Negation is normally realised in the I-domain (Belletti 1990; Zanuttini 1997a; Ledgeway 2000:168–9) and cannot be lexicalised if the complement is reduced:

(59)   a. *#Voglio   non   vedere   il film.* [15]

             want.1SG   NEG   see.INF   the movie

             Intended 'I don't want to see the movie.'

   b. *Non   voglio   vedere   il film.*

             NEG   want.1SG   see.INF   the movie

             'I do not want to see the movie.'

                                                        (It.)

(60)   a. *Ammise   di non capire.*

             admit.PRET.3SG of NEG understand.INF

             'S/he admitted s/he did not understand.'

   b. *Non ammise   di capire.*

             NEG admit.PRET.3SG   of understand.INF

             'S/he did not admit s/he understood.'

   c. *Non ammise   di non capire.*

             NEG admit.PRET.3SG   of NEG understand.INF

             'S/he did not admit s/he did not understand.'

                                                            (It.)

As shown in the Italian examples in (59), with a reduced complement such as (59a), the negation is necessarily realised in the matrix clause and takes scope over the whole verbal complex. Instead, in case of a verb selecting a full verbal complement (CP), such as *ammettere* 'to admit' in (60), there are two possible positions for negation, one in the matrix clause, taking scope over the matrix event (60b); and one in the embedded clause, taking scope over the embedded

---

[15] This is grammatical however under a constrastive reading of the complement.

verb (60a). In fact, both can be realised at the same time (60c). Independent negation can therefore be used as a diagnostic for complement size.

In Verbicarese, the complement of all three verbs under examination (*decide, fənì* and *putwí*) can be negated:

(61) a. *M'ajə   cumbwinda i   no   bbwivə   cchiù.*
      REFL=have.1SG convinced of NEG   drink.INF   anymore
      'I have decided to not drink anymore.'

    b. *Maria s'a   cumbwinda cchə Vvitə non adda   jì   a Nnapələ.*
      Maria REFL=have.3SG convinced   that   Vito NEG have.to.3SG go.INF to Naples.
      'Maria has decided that Vito should not go to Naples.'

    c. *Putera   no   jjì   alla festa.*
      can.COND.1SG   NEG   go.INF   to.the party
      'I could not go to the party.'

    d. *Finiscə   i non   fa   nentə.*
      finish.1SG   of NEG   do.INF   nothing
      'I stop not doing anything.'

    e. *Ajə   cumingiatə a non ce capiscə   cchiù   nnwentə.*
      have.1SG begun   to NEG LOC=understand.INF anymore nothing
      'I have begun to not understand anything anymore.'

                                       (USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

This test therefore does not yield a strong contrast between the complements to the different verb types, as it shows that a NegP is projected in all three complements.

In Romanian, independent negation is possible in all types of embedded subjunctive clauses (62-4), which seems to indicate that there is a NegP in all of these complements. In fact, two clausal negators can co-occur, one in the matrix and one in the embedded clause, as in (63-64) (Nicolae 2016: 17):

(62) a. *Cum pot   să   nu   mai   urmăresc   activitățile   cuiva?*
      how can.1SG   SA NEG   anymore follow.SBJV.1SG activities.DET   someone.GEN
      'How can I not follow someone's activities any longer?'

    b. *Pot   să nu fiu   de acord   cu   Mircea Badea.*
      can.1SG   SA NEG be.SBJV.1SG of agreement   with Mircea Badea
      'I can disagree with Mircea Badea.'

    c. *Fata e   talentată și   știe   să nu fie,   niciodată,   banală.*
      girl.DET be.3SG talented and   know.3SG   SA NEG is.SBJV   never   banal

'The girl is talented and knows how to never be boring.'

(Ro., examples via Google)

(63) *Nu   pot   să nu citesc.*
      NEG   can.1SG   SA not read.SBJV.1SG
      'I cannot not read.'

(Ro., Nicolae 2016:17)

(64) a. *Nu am   continuat să   gatesc.*
          NEG have.1SG   continued SA   cook.SBJV.1SG
          'I have not continued cooking.'

      b. *Am   continuat să nu   gatesc.*
          have.1SG continued SA NEG   cook.SBJV.1SG
          'I have continued not to cook.'

      c. *Nu   am   continuat   să nu gatesc.*
          NEG   have.1SG continued   SA NEG cook.SBJV.1SG
          'I have not continued not to cook.'

(Ro., Alexiadou et al. 2012:92)

The fact that all types of complements (to modals, aspectuals and control verbs) allow independent negation shows us that in all types the Neg head is projected.

In the Calabrian variety of Nicotera, the grammaticality of independent negation shows a contrast between complement types: not all *mu*-selecting predicates allow for an independently negated complement. Auxiliaries and aspecuals do not allow for a negative mu-complement:

(65) a. **Finisci   nommu fuma   sigaretti.*
          finish.3SG   NEG=MU smoke.3SG cigarettes
          'S/he finishes not smoking cigarettes.'

      b. **Continua   nommu scrivi.*
          continue.3SG   NEG=MU write.3SG
          'S/he continues not to write.'

      c. **Cuminicia nommu scrivi   u libru.*
          start.3SG   NEG=MU write.3SG the book
          'S/he starts not to write.'

      d. **Avi   nommu scrivi.*
          have.3SG NEG=MU write.3SG
          'S/he must not write.'

e. **Prova   nommu   scrivi.*

    try.3SG   NEG=MU   write.3SG

    'S/he tries not to write.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Taylor 2014:196)</div>

On the other hand, our Calabrian informant from Bova accepts negation in all types of complements:

(66) a. *Cercu   sempri non mi fumu.*

       try.1SG   always NEG MU smoke.1SG

       'I always try not to smoke.'

    b*.* *Decidia   non mi   fumu   chiù.*

       decide.IMPF.1SG   NEG=MU smoke.1SG anymore

       'I decided not to smoke anymore.'

    c*.* *Pozzu   non mi   vaiu   a festa.*

       can.1SG   NEG=MU go.1SG   to party

       'I can not go to the party.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

Both clauses can also be negated, as in these examples of a modal or aspectual selecting the *mu*-complement:

(67) *Non pozzu   non mi   nci'u dicu   a me maritu.*

     NEG can.1SG NEG=MU   to.him=it=I.say   to my husband

     'I cannot not tell my husband.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(68) *Non ncuminciai   non mi lu mbivu   lu latti.*

     NEG start.PRET.1SG NEG=MU it=drink.1SG the milk

     'I did not start not drinking the milk.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:116)</div>

We can therefore conclude that there is a NegP present in all *mu*-clauses in Bovese, but not in Nicoterese.

Salentino patterns like Verbicarese, Romanian and Bovese in that negation is possible not only in complement clauses introduced by *cu* in case of conatives and control verbs, but also with modals:

(69) a. *Decidu   cu nu fumu   cchiui.*
       decide.1SG   CU NEG smoke.1SG anymore
       'I decide not to smoke anymore.'

    b. *Nu possu   cu no dicu   nenzi   a maritama.*
       not can.1SG CU NEG say.1SG nothing to husband=my
       'I cannot say nothing to my husband.'

    c. *La spicci   cu nu   mme siènti?*
       it=stop.2SG CU NEG   me=hear.2SG
       'Can you stop not listening to me?'

                                                (Sal., Lequile (LE))

This seems to indicate that all *cu*-complements have a NegP within their functional structure.

    Cinque (1999:121), basing himself partly on Zanuttini's (1997a) work, argues that there are several functional heads which can host negation in the lower parts of the inflectional domain, and that languages can vary in which they realise with some languages being able to lexicalise more of them. This seems to be the case in our data. Some complements do allow negation to appear in complements to restructuring verbs such as aspectual verbs. The variation witnessed across the four varieties studied here might be due to the availability or unavailability of these lower negation-related heads, and can be explained as a case of (micro)parametric variation.

5.4 NPI licensing

Negative polarity items are negative elements that need to be licensed by another negative element, typically the main negator of the clause. This licensing is often thought to be impossible across CPs, as it is blocked by the presence of a C-head. NPI licensing can therefore be used as a test for complement size: if the NPI cannot be licensed by the matrix negator, this might possibly indicate the presence of a C-head.

    In Verbicarese, the NPI element can only be licensed by the higher negation, the lower negation is unavailable in case of *putwí* 'can' and *finì* 'finish':

(70) *Non pozzǝ vi   a   nnisciunǝ.*
     NEG can.1SG see.INF   DOM   nobody
     'I cannot see anyone.'

                                            (USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

(71) *Non fǝniscǝ   i (*non) leggǝ   nentǝ.*

NEG finish.1SG of NEG   read.INF nothing

'I finish not reading anything.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

With the control verb *cumbwingə,* the situation is different. The negator can marginally be located in the embedded clause, as in (72a). It can also be located in the matrix clause (72b). Both clauses can also be negated, yielding double negation (72c):

(72) a. *M'ajə   cumbwinda i no   bbwi   a   nuddə.*
       REFL=have.1SG convinced   of NEG see.INF DOM   nobody

       'I have decided to not seen anyone.'

   b. ??*No m'ajə   cumbwinda i vi   a   nnuddə.*
       NEG   REFL=have.1SG convinced   of see.INF   DOM   nobody

       'I have not decide to see anyone.'

   c. *No   m'ajə   cumbwinda i no   bbwi   a   nnuddə.*
       NEG   REFL=have.1SG convinced   of NEG see.INF DOM   nobody

       'I have not decided to see nobody.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

This means that there is a Neg position available in the embedded clause, but that an NPI element can also marginally be licensed by a negator in the matrix clause.

In case of the finite complement, which we expect to be a CP, the negator cannot raise to the matrix clause:

(73) *No m'ajə   cumbwinda cchə *(nno) bbwighə a   nnuddə.*
    NEG REFL= have.1SG   convinced   that NEG   see.1SG DOM   nobody

    'I have not decided that I should not see anyone.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

Also in Romanian, negative polarity items (NPIs) need to be licensed by the negator *nu* 'not'. The following examples show that not all *să*-clauses behave the same with respect to NPI licensing:

(74) a. *Nu   vreau   să văd   pe   nimeni.*
       NEG   want.1SG   SA see.SBJV.1SG DOM   nobody

   b. *Vreau   să nu   văd   pe nimeni.*
       want.1SG   SA NEG   see. SBJV.1SG DOM nobody

'I do not want to see anybody.'

(Ro.)

(75) a. *Nu încep   să citesc   nimic.*
   NEG=start.1SG SA read.SBJV.1SG   nothing

   b. *Încep   să nu   citesc   nimic.*
   start.1SG SA NEG   read.SBJV.1SG   anything

   'I start not to read anything.'

(Ro.)

(76) a. *Nu încerc   să fac   pe   nimeni   să se simtă   prost.*
   NEG try.1SG SA make.SBJV.1SG   DOM   anybody SA REFL=feel.SBVJ.3SG stupid

   b. *Încerc   să nu   fac   pe   nimeni   să se simtă   prost.*
   try.1SG   SA NEG   make.SBJV.1SG DOM   anybody   SA REFL=feel.SBVJ.3SG stupid

   'I try not to make anyone feel stupid.'

(Ro.)

(77) a. **N-am   ales   să vorbesc   cu   nimeni.*
   NEG have.1SG   decided SA speak.SBJV.1SG with nobody

   b. *Am   ales   să nu   vorbesc   cu   nimeni.*
   have.1SG decided SA NEG   speak.SBJV.1SG with nobody

   'I have decided not to speak with anybody.'

(Ro.)

(78) a. **Nu mi-a   spus să vorbesc   cu   nimeni despre   asta.*
   NEG to.me=have.3SG said SA   speak.SBJV.1SG with nobody about   this

   b. *Mi-a   spus să nu   vorbesc   cu   nimeni despre asta.*
   to.me=have.3SG   said SA   NEG   speak.SBJV.1SG with nobody about   this

   'He told me not to speak with anybody about this.'

(Ro.)

(79) a. **Doctorul   nu   mi-a   spus să mănânc   nimic.*
   doctor.DET NEG   to.me= have.3SG   said SA eat.SBJV.1SG nothing

   b. *Doctorul   mi-a   spus să nu   mănânc   nimic.*
   doctor.DET to.me=have.3SG   said SA NEG eat.SBJV.1SG nothing

   'The doctor told me to eat nothing.'

(Ro.)

In (74)-(76), the embedded NPI can (but need not) be licensed by the negation in the matrix clause. This is however not possible with the control verbs in (77)-(79). This test shows a contrast between (CP) complements of control verbs on the one hand and the reduced complements on the other. This can be explained by assuming that there is a CP in the embedded clause in the case of control verbs, but not in the case of modals.

In southern Calabrian, licensing of NPIs is possible for a negator outside the embedded clause with complement modals (80), desiderative verbs (81)-(82) and object control verbs (83):

(80) *'On ponnu u m'û   vidanu   'e nenta*
  NEG can.3PL MU=him see.3PL   of nothing
  'They cannot stand him at all.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Chillà & Citraro 2012:137)</div>

(81) a. *Non voghhiu   mi viu   a   nuddu.*
    NEG want.1SG   MU see.1SG   DOM   nobody
  b. *Vogghiu   non mi   viu   a   nuddu.*
    want.1SG   NEG=MU   see.1SG   DOM   nobody
    'I don't want to see anybody.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(82) *Non   vogghiu   mi faci   nenti.*
  NEG   want.1SG   MU do.3SG   nothing
  'I do not want him to do anything.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(83) a. *U medicu   mi dissi   non mi mangiu nenti.*
    the doctor   to.me=say.PRET.3SG   NEG MU eat.1SG nothing
  b. **U medicu no   mi dissi   mi mangiu nenti.*
    the doctor NEG to.me=say.PRET.3SG   MU eat.1SG nothing
    'The doctor told me not to eat anything.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

This test shows a contrast between modal/restructuring verbs on the one hand and lexical control verbs on the other. However, the non-restructured future-oriented complement of *volere* 'want' does allow non-raising also when the two subjects do not coincide. The contrast between the

complement types (reduced and non-reduced) as highlighted by this test is thus not very sharp. It seems that lexical factors are at play, as in Standard Italian where some lexical control verbs still allow NPI licensing between the complement and matrix clause (Manzotti & Rigamonti 2001).

In Salentino, NPI licensing is possible with restructuring verbs such as *volere*, but not with control verbs such as *decidu* 'I decide':

(84) *Nu bbògghiu   cu mmangiu   nienzi.*
    NEG want.1SG   CU eat.1SG   nothing
    'I do not want to eat anything.'

(85) a. **Nu decidu   cu mangiu   nenzi.*
       NEG decide.1SG CU eat.1SG   nothing

    b. *Decidu   cu nu   mangiu   nenzi.*
       decide.1SG   CU NEG   eat.1SG   nothing
       'I decide not to eat anything.'

                                                             (Sal., Lequile (LE))

Other object control verbs, however, do allow Neg-raising:

(86) a. *Lu tuttore   mave   tittu cu nu   mangiu   nenzi.*
       the doctor   to.me=have.3SG   said CU NEG   eat.1SG   nothing
       'The doctor told me not to eat anything.'

    b. *Lu tuttore   nu ma   tittu cu nu   mangiu   nenzi.*
       the doctor   NEG to.me= have.3SG   said CU NEG   eat.1SG   nothing
       'The doctor did not tell me to eat nothing.'

    c. ?*Lu tuttore nu   ma   tittu cu   mangiu   nenzi.*
       the doctor NEG me= have.3SG   said CU   eat.1SG   nothing
       'The doctor did not tell me to eat anything.'

                                                              (Sal., Lequile (LE))

The fact that the NPIs can be licensed across clause-boundaries seems to indicate that the embedded clause introduced by *cu* is not headed by a C head lexicalising Force in all cases of control verbs. The contrast, as in Romanian, is not very sharp.

5.5 *Wh*-elements

If there is a C-domain present in the complement clause, we expect there to be a possible intermediate landing site for *wh*-elements that can combine with *să*. Alboiu (2006) argues that the possibility of having a *wh*-clause differentiates types of *să*-complements. With aspectuals (87), there is no intermediate landing site for *wh*-elements. For modals (88)-(89), the situation seems to be the same:

(87) a. *Ce   va   începe   Mihai să cânte?*
          what AUX.FUT.3SG begin.INF Mihai SA sing.SBJV.3SG

     b. *#Mihai va   începe   (*ce)   să cânte?*
          Mihai AUX.FUT.3SG begin.INF   (what) SA sing.SBJV.3SG
          'What will Mihai start to sing?'

                                                    (Ro., adapted from Alboiu 2006:20)

(88) a. *Ce   poate   Radu să mănânce?*
          what can.3SG Radu SA eat.SBJV.3SG

     b. **#Poate ce   să mănânce   Radu?*
          can.3SG what   SA eat.SBJV.3SG Radu
          'What can Radu eat?'

                                                    (Ro.)

(89) a. *Ce   limba   ştie   să vorbească   Ana?*
          what language know.3SG   SA speak.SBJV.3SG Ana

     b. *#Ştie   ce   limba   să vorbească   Ana?*
          know.3SG what language SA speak.SBJV.3SG Ana
          'What language can Ana speak?'

                                                    (Ro.)

However, the b-variants of all three sentences are possible as echo-questions. Furthermore, if we change the sentences to accommodate two *wh*-elements, the intermediate landing site in the CP of the embedded clause becomes available for the lower *wh*-element:

(90) a. *Cine ce   poate   să citească?*
          who   what can.3SG SA read.SBJV.3SG

     b. *Cine poate   ce   să citească?*
          who can.3SG   what SA read.SBJV.3SG

'Who can read what?'

(Ro., Nicolae 2016:21)

These latter examples show that a left periphery and a possible landing site for partial *wh*-fronting is present even in all types of *să*-complements, even when it is selected by a modal verb.

In southern Calabrian, *mu* can co-occur with wh-elements. Whenever the verb is an epistemic verb such as *sacciu* 'I know', the embedded question can feature *mi*:

(91) *Non   sacciu   chimmu   dico.*
     NEG   know.1SG   what=MU   say.1SG
     'I do not know what to say.'

(SCal., Locri (CZ), Damonte 2009:232)

(92) a. *Sai comu/quandu/aundi   (?mi) vai?*
       know.2SG how/when/where   MU=go.2SG
       'Do you know how/when/where to go?'
    b. *Non sapi   comu/quandu/aundi mi vai*
       NEG know.3SG   how/when/where   MU=go.3SG
       'S/he does not know how/when/where to go.'

(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:158)

On the basis of these data, we can conclude there is a CP present in these complements introduced by *mu* in Bovese.

In contrast to Calabrian *mu* and Romanian *să*, Salentino *cu* can never co-occur with wh-elements:

(93) **Me sta   ddumannu ntʃe ku addʒu   fare.*
     me=stay.1SG   ask.1SG   what CU have.1SG   do.INF
     'I am asking myself what I should do.'

(Sal., Calabrese 1992:279)

This test can therefore not be applied to Salentino. The same goes for Verbicarese, where *chə* cannot co-occur with wh-elements.

5.6 Adverbs

As shown by the seminal work of Cinque (1999), adverbs lexicalise the specifier position of a series of functional heads in the I-domain which occur in the same order cross-linguistically. Adverbs can therefore be used as a diagnostic for the projection of functional structure. If a certain adverb can be embedded in the complement clause, this shows that the corresponding functional head is projected. Adverbs are generally divided into the higher adverb space (HAS, "higher adverbs" in Cinque's (1999) terms), comprising the adverbs from Mood$_{speechact}$ to Mod$_{volitional}$, and lower adverbs (LAS, or "lower pre-VP adverbs" in Cinque (1999)), which includes all adverbs lower than Mod$_{volitional}$, comprising mostly aspectual projections and Voice (Cinque 1999; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005:81ff.; Ledgeway & Roberts forthcoming). By testing the grammaticality of adverbs from both spaces, the structural size of a complement can be established.

In Verbicarese, the complements to all three verbs under examination can contain adverbs of the LAS, as is expected under our hypothesis:

(94) a. *No pozzə   jjì   abbogghia   n feriə.*
        NEG can.1SG go.INF often   in holiday
        'I cannot often go on holiday.'
    b. *Finiscə   i puləzzà   bona a casa.*
        finish.1SG   of clean.INF well   the house
        'I finish cleaning the house well.'
    c. *M'ajə   cumbwinda i   fa   i purpuettə   priəstə.*
        REFL=have.1SG convinced   of make.INF   the meatballs   early
        'I have decided to prepare the meatballs early.'

                                                                (USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

The HAS adverbs, on the other hand, are not expected to be grammatical in all complement types. If the complement is a mere *v*P, none of them should be allowed. Similarly, if the complement is a IP, not all HAS adverbs should be grammatical. However, we do find that HAS adverbs can be embedded in all three complements:

(95) a. *Mə pozzə   sbaglià   apposta.*
        REFL=can.1SG   err.INF   on.purpose
        'I can make mistakes on purpose.'
    b. *Cumwingə   a sbaglià   apposta.*
        start.1SG   to err.INF   on.purpose

'I start to make mistakes on purpose.'

c. *Singhə ji ca   me cumbwingə   i sbaglià   apposta.*

be.1SG I that   REFL=convince.1SG   of err.INF   on.purpose

'I decide to make mistakes on purpose.'

d. *Maria s'a   cumbwinda cchə Vitə adda   jjì   a Nnapələ   apposta.*

Maria REFL=have.3SG convinced   that Vito have.to.3SG go.INF to Naples   on purpose.

'Maria has decided that Vito should go to Naples on purpose.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

This might indicate that all complements contain the related functional heads (at least up until Mod$_{volitional}$). Another explanation might be related to the actual scope of the adverbs. If the adverb takes scope over the whole clause rather than the complement clause, it is located in the matrix clause and is not indicative of complement size. In this case, the adverb appears after the verb because it has been dislocated.

In Romanian, all complement types can embed adverbs from the HAS:[16]

(96) a. *Putem   să plecăm   (probabil/intenţionat/din nou)   la mare.*

can.1PL   SA leave.1PL (probably/intentionally/again)   to sea

'We can leave (probably/intentionally/again) to the sea.'

b. *Ana încearcă   să   facă   (?probabil/ intenţionat/din nou) sarmale cu mamaligă.*

Ana try.3SG   SA make.SBJV.3SG (probably/intentionally/again) sarmale with polenta

'Ana tries to make (probably/intentionally/again) sarmale with polenta.'

c. *Ştie   să vorbească   (?probabil /intenţionat/din nou)   limba   română.*

know.3SG   SA speak.SBJV.3SG (probably/intentionally/again)   language   Romanian

'S/he can speak (probably/intentionally/again) Romanian.'

d. *Ion decide   să meargă   (?probabil/intenţionat/din nou) în Italia   în vacanţă.*

Ion decide.3SG SA go.SBJV.3SG (probably/intentionally/again) to Italy   on holiday

'Ion decides to go (probably/intentionally/again) to Italy on holiday.'

(Ro.)

According to my informants, these examples are a bit odd, but are grammatical. The grammaticality of these adverb positions shows us that in all types of complements introduced by *să*, the higher functional projections are projected.

---

[16] The adverb *aparent* 'apparently' cannot be embedded because it behaves as a parenthetical (Alexandru Nicolae, p.c.).

Since HAS adverbs are allowed in all *să*-complements, it is unsurprising that adverbs from the LAS are also grammatical in the complement clause of *a putea* and *a şti*:

(97) a. *Pot   să plec   des   la mare.*
          can.1SG   SA leave.SBJV.1SG   often to sea
          'I can go often to the sea.'

      b. *Copilul   ştie   să scrie   deja.*
          child.DET   know.3SG   SA write.SBJV.3SG   already
          'The child can write already.'

                                                                (Ro.)

On the other hand, in a southern Calabrian variety such as Nicoterese, as shown by Taylor (2014), the adverbs from the HAS are only possible in a subtype of *mu*-complement clauses; specifically, in the clauses selected by control verbs such as *prova* 'try' (99). With modals (98), these higher adverbs from the HAS cannot be embedded:

(98) a. *Gianni voli   u si mangia   (*veramenti)   u paninu.*
          Gianni want.3SG   MU   REFL=eat.3SG   truly   the sandwich
          'Gianni wants to (really) eat the panino.'

      b. *Gianni volarria   u si mangia (* probabilmenti) u paninu.*
          Gianni want.COND.3SG   MU REFL= eat.3SG probably   the sandwich
          'Gianni would like to (probably) eat the panino.'

      c. *Gianni voli   u arriva   (*apparentementi)   'n tiempu   Maria.*
          Gianni want.3SG   MU arrive.3SG   apparently   in time   Maria
          'Gianni wants Maria to apparently arrive on time.'

      d. *Mo   no   pozzu   viniri   c'haju   mu civu   (*possibilmenti)   o figghjolu.*
          now   NEG   can.1SG   come.INF LOC.have.1SG MU feed.1SG   (possibly)   to.the son
          'At present I cannot come as I possibly have to feed my son.'

                                                (SCal., Taylor 2014:201–2)

(99) a. *Gianni prova   u si mangia   (veramenti) u paninu.*
          Gianni try.3SG   MU REFL= eat.3SG   really   the sandwich
          'Gianni tries to really eat the sandwich.'

      b. *Gianni prova   u arriva   (certamenti) 'n tiempo.*
          Gianni try.3SG   MU arrive.3SG   certainly   in time
          'Gianni tries to arrive certainly on time.'

                                                (SCal., Taylor 2014:204)

The adverbs corresponding to the two lowest positions within the HAS, on the other hand, are grammatical in the *mu*-complements selected by both modals and conatives:

(100) a. *Haju   u cangiu   nurmalmenti   u crinu   di matarazzi.*
        have.1SG MU change.1SG normally   the horsehair   of mattress
        'I have to normally change the horsehair of the mattress.'

   b. *Gianmaria vozzi   u ruppi   intenzionalmenti u vitru.*
      Gianmaria want.3SG   MU break.3SG   intentionally   the glass.
      'Gianmaria wants to intentionally break the glass.'

                                                                    (SCal., Taylor 2014:203)

(101) a. *Gianni prova   u cangiu   regolarmenti   u crinu   di matarazzi.*
        Gianni try.3SG MU change.3SG regularly   the horsehair   of mattress
        'Gianni tries to regularly change the horsehair of the mattress.'

   b. *Gianni prova   u nci duna   apposta   u regali   a Maria.*
      Gianni try.3SG MU to=her given on.purpose   the present to Maria
      'Gianni tries to give the present on purpose to Maria.'

                                                                    (SCal., Taylor 2014:203)

This shows that there is a difference in the complement size selected by control verbs on the one hand and by modal verbs on the other in Nicoterese. The latter select for complements that do not include the positions in the HAS higher than Asp$_{\text{frequentative(I)}}$. In contrast, adverbs from the LAS are allowed in all *mu*-complements:

(102) a. *Giuseppe   si stanca   u leggi   addinovu/tutt/spessu/ancora u libru.*
        Giuseppe   REFL=tire.3SG   MU reads   again/always/often/still   the book
        'Giuseppe is tired of reading the book again/always/often/still.'

   b. *Prova   u   scrivi   ancora.*
      try.3SG   MU writes   still
      'S/he tries to still write.'

   c. *Gianni prova   u cangiu   ggià   u crinu   di matarazzi.*
      Gianni try.3SG MU change.3SG already   the straw   of mattress
      'Gianni tries to change the straw of the mattress already.'

   d. *Gianni prova   u nci duna   rapidamenti   u regali   a Maria.*
      Gianni try.3SG MU to.her=give.3SG   quickly   the gift   to Maria

'Gianni tries to give the gift quickly to Maria.'

e. *Finisci   u   fuma   addinovu   sigaretti.*

finish.3SG   MU smoke.3SG again   cigarettes

'S/he finishes smoking cigarettes again.'

(SCal., Taylor 2014:205–6)

The LAS adverbs therefore do not indicate any difference between complements in any of the varieties under examination.

In Salentino, informants tend to translate HAS adverbs such as *regularly* with 'every day' or 'more often', which might indicate that these adverbs cannot naturally be embedded in the *cu*-clause. In another example, here represented in (103), the informant changes the verb to *crìsciu* which selects *ca*:

(103) a. *Ncìgnu   cu pulizzu   ogne giurnu   la casa.*

start.1SG CU clean.1SG   every day   the house

'I start to clean the house every day.'

b. *Crìsciu   ca   bba   ṭròu   quarche fiata te cchiùi li   parienti.*

decide.1SG that   go   find.1SG some   time of more   the   family.members

'I decide to go visit my relatives more often.'

(Sal., Lequile (LE))

This happens in both complements to aspectuals as well as complements to 'to decide'. The data seem to indicate that these higher adverbs are impossible in *cu*-clauses, as speakers change them or the matrix verbs when translating the sentences.

Second, in Salentino, adverbs from the LAS are allowed in all *cu*-complements, as expected:

(104) a. *'Ccumanzamu cu pulizzamu   sempre   a casa.*

start.1PL   CU clean.1PL   always   at home

'We start to always clean at home.'

b. *La maestra ole   cu se   studiane bene lu libru   tutti li studenti.*

the teacher want.3SG   CU REFL study   well   the book all the students

'The teacher wants all the students to study the book well.'

c. *Decidimu   cu sciamu   attorna in Puglia.*

decide.1PL CU go.1PL   again   in Puglia

'We decide to go again to Puglia.'

d. *Pozzu   scire   mute fiate alla   Puglia.*

can.1SG   go.INF   many times to.the Puglia

'I can go many times to Puglia.'

e. *Spìcciu   cu ffazzu   bbona sta fatia.*

finish.1SG   CU do.1SG   good this job

'I finish doing this job well.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Lequile (LE))</div>

The grammaticality of adverbs thus does not give clear indications of the structural size of the different complements introduced by *cu*.

5.7 Tough-movement

In Italian, transparency effects can be seen with restructuring verbs in tough-constructions (Postal 1971; Rizzi 1990). These constructions contain a predicative adjective and a subject clause. The object of this clause can be extracted and be promoted to the subject of the matrix clause:

(105) a. *E'   difficile leggere libri di sintassi.*

be.3SG   difficult read.INF books of syntax

'It is difficult to read syntax books.'

b. *Libri di sintassi   sono   difficili   da leggere.*

books of syntax   be.3PL   difficult.PL   to read.INF

'Syntax books are difficult to read.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

When the embedded clause contains a restructuring verb, tough-movement can apply to the object of the infinitival verb, as in (106). However, when the embedded clause contains a control verb, the object of the infinitive is too deeply embedded (107):

(106) a. *E'   facile cominciare a fumare   le sigarette.*

be.3SG   easy begin.INF   to smoke.INF   the cigarettes

'It is easy to begin smoking cigarettes.'

b. *Le sigarette sono   facili   da cominciare a fumare.*

the cigarettes be.3PL easy.PL   to start.INF   to smoke.INF

'Cigarettes are easy to start smoking.'

(107) a. *E'   facile convincersi   a smettere di fumare   le sigarette.*

be.3SG easy convince.INF=REFL to stop.INF of smoke.INF the cigarettes

'It is easy to convince yourself to smoke cigarettes.'

 b. *Le sigarette sono facili da convincersi a smettere di fumare.*

  the cigarettes be.3PL easy.PL to convince.INF=REFL to stop.INF of smoke.INF

  'Cigarettes are easy to convince yourself to smoke.'

<div align="right">(It., Taylor 2014:169)</div>

Tough-movement can therefore be used as a diagnostic for restructuring of the embedded clause (Taylor 2014:169).

 Also in Verbicarese, tough-movement proves grammatical with the modal *putwí* and the aspectual *fənì* but not with the modal or the control verb *cumvingə*:

(108) a. *I lingə   su ddəfficilə da studijà.*

   the languages be.3PL difficult to study.INF

   'Languages are difficult to be able to speak.'

 b. *Sa pitta è   ddəficila da finiscə i mangià.*

   the cake be.3SG difficult to finish.INF of eat.INF

   'Foreign languages are difficult to finish studying.'

 c. *Sa pitta jè   ddəfficila da puté fa   bona.*

   the cake be.3SG difficult to be.able.INF make.INF well

   'The cake is difficult to be able to make well.'

 d. *Sa pitta jè ffacəla da tə cumbwingə i fa.*

   the cake be.3SG easy to REFL=convince.INF of make.INF

   'The cake easy to convince to make.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

The movement is fully ungrammatical when *decide* takes a finite complement:

(109) *Sa pitta è   ffacəla da tə cumbwingə cchə (a) fai.*

  the cake be.3SG easy to REFL=convince that (it=)you.make

  Intended: 'The cake is easy to decide to make.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

This confirms our hypothesis that *fənì* takes a reduced complement, in contrast with the control verb *cumbwingə*.

 In Romanian, tough-constructions can be formed with the supine, the subjunctive and infinitives. When the complement contains a supine, extraction of the object is possible:

(110) a. *E   uşor de vorbit   limbi   străine.*
       be.3SG   easy of speak.SUP   languages   foreign
       'It is easy to speak foreign languages.'

   b. *Limbile   străine sunt   uşor de vorbit.*
      languages.DET   foreign be.3PL   easy of speak.SUP
       'Foreign languages are easy to speak.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

However, extraction is never possible with a subjunctive complement to tough-clauses:

(111) a. *E   uşor să vorbesc   limbi   străine.*
       be.3SG   easy SA speak.SBJV.1SG   languages   foreign
       'It is easy (for me) to speak foreign languages.'

   b. **Limbile   străine sunt   uşor să-le vorbesc.*
      languages.DET   foreign be.3PL   easy SA=them speak.SBJV.1SG
       'Foreign languages are easy for me to speak.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

This test therefore does not show us any contrast between different types of *să*-complements, as extraction is blocked in general. This can be accounted for if we assume that all subjunctive complements are CPs (even though unexpected from a purely semantic viewpoint), but is unexpected under the hypothesis that the *să*-clause can also be smaller in size.

In Bovese tough-movement is impossible in general. This test can therefore not be used to establish the size of the complement introduced by *mu*. In Salentino, on the other hand, tough-movement seems possible with both aspectual verbs and control verbs:

(112) a. *Le lingue   straniere su   difficili   cu cummenzi   le cunti.*
       the languages   foreign   be.3PL   difficult   CU start.2SG   them=you.speak
       'Foreign languages are difficult to start to speak.'

   b. *Le lingue   straniere su   difficili   cu se 'mparane   cu se cuntane.*
      the languages   foreign   be.3PL   difficult.PL   CU REFL=learn.3PL CU REFL=speak.3PL
      'Foreign languages are difficult to learn to speak.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Lequile (LE))</div>

Other speakers however seem to prefer the infinitive in these contexts or to not extract the object (113):

(113) a. *Le lingue   te fore   su   tosțe   cu le sspicci   te mparare.*
    the languages of outside be.3PL difficult CU them=stop.2SG of learn.INF
    'Foreign languages are hard to stop learning.'

    b. *Le lingue   de fore   su   tosțe   cu tte le mpari   a parlare.*
    the languages of outside be.3PL difficult CU you=them=learn.SG to speak.INF
    'Foreign languages are difficult to learn to speak.'

    c. *È   facile cu tte minti cu tte mpari   le lingue   te fore*,
    be.3SG   easy CU REFL=put CU REFL=learn   the languages of outside
    ma nu   bbe   filu   facile cu tte le mpari   a parlare!
    but NEG be.3SG   at.all easy CU REFL=them=you.learn   to speak.INF
    'It is easy to start learning foreign languages, but it is not easy to learn to speak them!'

                                                       (Sal., Lequile (LE))

Extraction of the object is thus not blocked by *cu* in Salentino. However, with two embedded clauses, some speakers prefer the infinitive above the *cu*-clause. Also, the extraction seems more readily available when the object is located in a clause embedded under an aspectual rather than under a control verb.

5.8 Availability of topic-focus fields

If the embedded clause is only a *v*P or a TP, we expect the higher left periphery of the clause to be absent. The presence of a periphery can be tested by trying to front elements, such as a focused object, as in the following examples:

(114) a. *(U VWINƏ RUSSƏ) Vitə s'a   cumbwində (*?U VWINƏ RUSSƏ) i servə   U*
    the wine red Vito REFL=has.3SG convinced the wine red   of serve.INF the
    VWINƏ RUSSƏ   no   cuiddə   jwanchə.
    wine red   NEG that   white
    'Vito has decided to serve the red one, not the white one.'

    b. *(I TAGGHIARIEDDƏ) ajə   fənitə (*I TAGGHIARIEDDƏ) i fa   I TAGGHIARIEDDƏ,*
    the tagliatelle   have.1SG finished the tagliattelle of make.INF the tagliatelle
    no   u suchə.
    NEG   the sauce
    'I have finished preparing the tagliatelle, not the sauce.'

c. *(U PWIESCƏ) po'   (*U PWIESCƏ) mangià (U PWIESCƏ), no a carna*.

the fish   can.3SG the fish   eat.INF   the fish   NEG the meat

'He can eat fish, not meat.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

This test does not yield a clear contrast between complement types. Speakers prefer to place the focused object at the beginning of the matrix clause or at the very end of the sentence. It can also be placed at the beginning of the embedded clause when the matrix verbs are *decide* or *finì.* In the latter case, the focused element can also be located in the lower left periphery (Belletti 2004; 2005).

With a finite complement of *decide,* both topic (115a) and focus (115b) positions are available:

(115) a. *Mə cumbwinge   (?sta materia) che   sta materia âja   studijà   bona.*
REFL=convince.1SG   this subject   that i this subject it=have.to.1SG study.INF well
'I decide that this subject, we have to study it very well.'

   b. *M'ajə   cumbwinda cchə U VRƏVƏCARISƏ   ama   parlà   no   u talianə.*
REFL=have.1SG convinced   that the Verbicarese   must.1PL speak.INF   NEG   the Italian
'I decide that we speak Verbicarese, not Italian.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

With the topic, a position before *chə* is available but the position after the complementiser is preferred. For focus, on the other hand, only the position following the complementiser is available. The left periphery is thus available in finite complements of *decide* and follows the complementiser.

If the embedded clause is only a TP, we expect the left periphery of the clause to be absent. The presence of a periphery can be tested by trying to front elements, such as a focused subject or a clitic left-dislocated object. In Romanian, this is grammatical even with modal verbs such as *a putea*, as shown by the following sentences:

(116) a. *Putem   ca   NOI   să plecăm   la mare.*
can.1PL   that   we   SA leave.SBJV.1PL   to sea
'WE can leave for the sea.'

   b. *Mai putem   ca   pe x2-4x-2 / x2+4x+4   să-l   aducem   la o   fracţie*
still can.1PL   that.SBJV DOM x2-4x-2/x2+4x+4   SA=IT reduce.SBJV.1PL   at a   fraction
mai   simplă.

more simple

'We can reduce x2-4x-2/x2+4x+4 further to a simpler fraction.'

c. *Radu ştie   (ca)   limba română   s-o   vorbească,   (nu limba   olandeză).*
   Radu know.3SG that language Romanian   sa=it speaks.SBJV.3SG NEG language Dutch
   'Radu can speak Romanian, not Dutch.'

This latter example shows us that in the subjunctive complement of the modal *a putea* the left periphery is activated.[17]

The situation is less clear for complements to aspectual verbs. Alboiu (2006) reports that fronting with aspectual verbs is impossible, but possible with control verbs. Our informants, however, accept fronting in all sentences:

(117) a. *Victor va   începe   (ca   pe   Mihai) să-l   ajute.*
        Victor AUX.FUT.3SG begin.INF   that DOM   Mihai SA=him help.SBJV.3SG
        'Victor will begin to help him/Mihai.'

   b. *Victor va   începe   să-l   ajute   (pe Mihai).*
        Victor AUX.FUT.3SG begin.INF   SA=him   help.SBJV.3SG   DOM Mihai
        'Victor will begin to help him (Mihai).'

(118) *L-am   rugat pe   Ion   ca   mâine   să plimbe   el   câinele.*
       him=have.1SG asked DOM Ion   that tomorrow   SA walk.SBJV.3SG   he.NOM   dog
       'I asked Ion to walk the dogs tomorrow.'

This is confirmed by Cotfas (2016a:101–115, 157–8), who reports similar findings. Her study shows that speakers accept *ca* followed by left-peripheral constituents in complements to aspectual, modals and implicative verbs such as *a încerca* 'to try' and *a reuşi* 'to succeed'.

In Bovese, a left periphery can be activated with focus or topic elements whenever the *mu*-complement is selected by desiderative verbs:

---

[17] One could object that this fronting position is located within the lower left periphery of the clause (Belletti 2004; 2005). The data can also be explained this way, but we assume that we are dealing with the higher left periphery as the other tests seem to indicate a CP structure for all *să*-complements.

(119) *Speramu   armenu U FOCU   nomm'u   ddumanu   stasira.*

      wish.1PL   at.least   the fire   NEG=MU=it   light.3PL   tonight

      'Let's hope that they don't light the bonfire at least tonight.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:157)</div>

(120) *Me mamma voli   I FIGGHIOLI/**i figghioli**/*i figghioli   mi mangianu   i pretali,*

      my mother want.3SG the children/the children/the children MU eat.3PL   the pretali,

      no   vui!

      not   you.PL

      'My mother wants the children to eat the pretali, not you!'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:152)</div>

However, modals or aspectuals do not allow this focus position:

(121) a. *Pozzu (*SULU   U   PANI   SENZA   GLUTINE) mi mangiu sulu U PANI SENZA GLUTINE*

         can.1SG only   the bread   without gluten   MU eat.1SG only the bread without gluten

         non   chiddu   normali.

         NEG   that   normal.

         'I can only eat bread without gluten, not the normal one.'

    b. **Finiscu   A   PAOLO mi iutu,   no   a   Maria.*

         finish.1SG   DOM   Paolo MU help.1SG NEG   DOM   Maria

         'I finish helping Paolo, not Maria.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

The left-periphery focus position is thus only available in the complements to desiderative verbs. This suggests that these complements are structurally bigger than those to modals or aspectuals. The same result is found for another southern Calabrian variety, namely that of Nicotera (Taylor 2014:197–200).

In Salentino, not all speakers seem to make use of focus fronting to the left edge of the embedded clause. For speakers who do, they allow focus fronting more readily with a CP-selecting verb such as *volere* than with a modal (123a) or aspectual (123b):

(122) a. ?**Sape   LU FRANCESE cu conta,   none lu tedesco.*

         know.3SG   the French CU speak.3SG   NEG   the German

         'He can speak French, not German.'

    b. **Lu Marcu ha   spicciatu LU PAOLO   cu aiuta,   none la Maria.*

the Marco have.3SG finished the Paolo CU help.3SG NEG the Maria

'Marco has finished helping Paolo, not Maria.'

c. *La Federica decide* *LU VINU RUSSU* *cu porta* *e* *non cuiggiu biancu*.

the Federica decide.3SG the wine red CU bring.3SG and NEG that white

'Federica decides to bring the red wine, not the white one.'

d. *Oiu* *LU VINU RUSSU* *cu porta* *la Carla e* *none cuiggiu biancu.*

want.1SG the wine red CU bring.3SG the Carla and NEG that white

'I want Carla to bring the red wine, not the white one.'

(Sal.)

(123) a. *Sirma ulia* *JOU cu (*JOU) restu* *a casa* [...]

father want.IPFV.3SG I CU I remain.1SG at home

'Father wanted that I would stay at home.'

b. *Ojju* *CRAI* *cu bbene* *lu Mariu,* *none osce.*

want.1SG tomorrow CU come.3SG the Mariu, NEG today

'I want that Maria comes tomorrow, not today.'

(Sal., Damonte 2011:238)

This test shows a clear contrast in the complement structure depending on the type of verb selecting the *cu*-complement: the left periphery is only available in complements we hypothesised to be CPs. However, unexpectedly, the left periphery is not available in the complement of *decide* either, as can be seen in example (122c). This might be due to interspeaker variation. In the literature, examples of fronting with lexical control verbs can be found (123).

5.9 *Wh*-extraction of the complement

Only CP infinitival complements can be *wh*-extracted and moved to [spec,CP] of the matrix clause. The wh-phrase *che* 'what' can reference an infinitival CP argument (124), but not a *v*P-sized (125) or IP-sized (126) complement (Ledgeway 2000:162; Taylor 2014:189–90), as exemplified in the following Neapolitan data:

(124) a. *Giuanne se mette* *scuorno 'e dicere* *bucie.*

Giuanne REFL=put.3SG shame of tell.INF lies

'Giuanne is ashamed of telling lies.'

b. *'E che* *se mette* *scuorno Giuanne?*

of what REFL=put.3SG shame Giuanne

'Of what is Giuanne ashamed?'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:162)

(125) a. *Giuanne pô   /hadda   /sa   /vô   dicere   bucie.*
   Giuanne can.3SG   /have.to.3SG   /know.3SG   /want.3SG   tell.INF   lies
   'Giuanna can/must/knows how/wants to tell lies.'

  b. **Che pô   /hadda   /sa   /vô   Giuanne?*
   what can.3SG   /have.to.3SG   /know.3SG   /want.3SG   Giuanne
   'What can/must/knows/wants Giuanne?'

                (Nap., Ledgeway 2000:162)

(126) a. *Giuanne prov' a   / cerca 'e dicere   bucie.*
   Giuanne try.3SG to/ try.3SG of tell.INF   lies
   'Giuanne tries to tell lies.'

  b. **A/'e che   prova / cerca Giuanne?*
   to/of what   try.3SG/try.3SG Giuanne
   'What does Giuanne try?'

                (Nap., Ledgeway 2000:162)

  If we apply this test to Verbicarese, we see that only the complement of *decide* can be *wh-*extracted:

(127) a. *Vicienzə   pò   guidà   a machəna.*
   Vincenzo   can.3SG   drive.INF the car
   'Vincenzo can drive the car.'

  b. **Che pò   Vicienzə?*
   what can.3SG   Vincenzo
   'What can Vincenzo?'

               (USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

(128) a. *Vicienzə   finiscia   'i fà u mangià.*
   Vincenzo   finish.3SG   of prepare.INF the food
   'Vincenzo finishes preparing the food.'

  b. *#Che finiscia   Vicienzə?*
   what finish.3SG   Vincenzo
   'What finishes Vincenzo?'

               (USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

(129) a. *Giusəcedda s'a   cumbwinta 'i jì   a Nnapele.*

          Giuseppina REFL=has convinced   of go.INF to Naples

          'Giuseppina have.3SG decided to go to Naples.'

    b. *De cchə s'a   cumbwinta Giusəcedda?*

          of what REFL=have.3SG   convinced   Giuseppina

          'What has Giuseppina decided?'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

This shows us that only the complement of *decide* is a full CP; the other complements are reduced.

Extraction of the complement can therefore function as a test for the CP-status of the embedded clause. When applied to the Romanian complements introduced by *să*, we obtain the following results:

(130) a. *Ion   decide   să meargă   în Italia în vacanță.*

          Ion   decide.3SG SA go.SBJV.3SG in Italy   in holiday

          'Ion decides to go to Italy on holiday.'

    b. *Ce   decide   Ion?*

          what decide.3SG Ion

          'What does Ion decide?'

    c. *să meargă   în Italia în vacanță.*

          SA go.SBJV.3SG in Italy   in holiday

          'to go to Italy on holiday.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

(131) a. *Ion poate   să meargă   în Italia în vacanță.*

          Ion can.3SG SA go.SBJV.3SG   in Italy   in holiday

          'Ion can go on holiday to Italy.'

    b. *Ce   poate   Ion?*

          what can.3SG Ion

          'What can Ion?'

    c. *să meargă   în Italia în vacanță.*

          SA go.SBJV.3SG in Italy   in holiday

          '(to) go to Italy on holiday.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

(132) a. *Ana începe   să învețe   limba   română.*

          Ana begin.3SG SA learn.SBJV.3SG language Romanian

'Ana begins to study Romanian.'

b. *Ce   începe   Ana?*

what begin.3SG Ana

'What does Ana begin?'

c. *să înveţe   limba   română.*

SA learn.SBJV.3SG language   Romanian

'to study Romanian.'

(Ro.)

(133) a. *Ana încearcă   să facă   sarmale cu   mămaligă.*

Ana try.3SG   SA make.SBJV.3SG sarmale with polenta

'Ana tries to make sarmale with polenta.'

b. *Ce   încearcă Ana?*

what try.3SG   Ana

'What does Ana try?'

c. *să facă   sarmale cu   mămaligă.*

SA makes.SBJV.3SG sarmale with   polenta

'to make sarmale with polenta.'

(Ro.)

All *să*-clauses, whether complement to a modal, an aspectual or a control verb, can be *wh*-extracted, and occur in isolation as an answer. On the basis of this test, we can conclude that *all* Romanian *să*-complements are CPs.

In the Calabrian variety Nicoterese, as shown by Taylor (2014: 191-192), wh-extraction is possible with *mu*-complements that are CPs, but not with *mu*-complements that constitute *v*Ps or TPs:

(134) a. *Nci domandai   u   lava   i piatti.*

to.him=ask.PRET.1SG MU wash.3SG   the dishes

'I asked him to wash the dishes.'

b. *[Chi] nci domandai?*

what to.him=ask.PRET.1SG

'What did I ask him?'

(SCal., Taylor 2014:191–2)

(135) a. *Giuseppe poti   u leggi.*

Giuseppe can.3SG MU read.3SG

b. *[Chi] poti   Giuseppe?*

what can.3SG Giuseppe

(SCal., Taylor 2014:191–2)

(136) a. *Giuseppe   finisci   u scrivi.*

Giuseppe   finish.3SG   MU write.3SG

b. *[Chi] finisci   Giuseppe?*

what finish.3SG   Giuseppe

(SCal., Taylor 2014:191–2)

These data provide evidence that not all *mu*-clauses are full CPs. Only control verbs select full CPs, whereas conatives, aspectuals and modals select smaller complements which cannot be *wh*-extracted.

(137) a. *Lu Vincenzu   pò   purtare   la machina.*

the Vincenzo   can.3SG   bring.INF the car

'Vincenzo can bring the car.'

b. *Cce   ppò   purtare   lu Vincenzu?*

what can.3SG   bring.INF the Vincenzo?

'What can Vincenzo bring?'

(Sal., Lequile (LE))

(138) a. *La Laura   ha   spicciatu cu cconza   pe lla sira.*

the Laura   have.3SG stopped CU prepare.3SG   for the evening

'Laura stopped preparing dinner.'

b. *Cce bbe   spicciatu cu cconza   la Laura?*

what have.3SG stopped CU prepare.3SG the Laura

'What has Laura stopped to prepare?'

(Sal., Lequile (LE))

(139) a. *Lu Marcu   òle   cu bbae   a Lecce.*

the Marco   want3SG CU go3SG to Lecce

'Marco wants to go to Lecce.'

b. *Cce   bbòle   lu Marcu?*

what want.3SG   the Marco

'What does Marco want?'

In Salentino, the informant obligatorily repeated the complement in the question. Only with 'want' can the complement be omitted (as in Italian, cf. Cinque (2004:35–6) on an abstract verbal complement paraphrasable as HAVE). *Wh*-extraction of the complement clause is not possible.

5.10 Pronominalisation of the CP

The (un)grammaticality of the pronominalisation of complements can also be used to establish whether a complement is a CP or not, on the assumption that only CPs can be pronominalised. In Verbicarese, only the complement to the verb *decide* can be pronominalised; the complement to the aspectual *fənì* and the modal *putwí* cannot:

(140) a. *Me c'ajə   cumbwinda.*
        REFL=to.it=have.1SG   convinced
        'I have decided it.'

   b. *#Vicienzə   u finiscə.*
        Vincenzo   it=finish.3SG
        'Vincenzo finishes (doing) it.'

   c. **Vicienzə   u pò.*
        Vincenzo   it=can
        'Vincenzo can it.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

This shows that only the complement of *decide* is a full CP.

   In Romanian, *să* complements, like other argument clauses, can be pronominalised by both the clitic *o* 'her.F.SG.ACC' and the demonstrative *asta* 'this' (Zafiu 2013b:572)[18]:

(141) a. *(asta)   (o) decid.*
        this.F.SG   it.F.SG=decide.1SG
         'I decide this.'

   b. *(asta)   (o) pot.*
        this.F.SG   it.F.SG=can.1SG
         'I can (do) this.'

---

[18] Having only *asta* seems to be the preferred option.

c. *(asta)   (o) încep.*
   this.F.SG it.F.SG=start.1SG
   'I start this.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

The fact that all complements can be pronominalised with *asta* and/or *o* shows their argumental status: they are all CPs.

In Bovese, at first glance, the situation seems identical, as complements to aspectual verbs can be pronominalised:

(142) *Ora   i ncumenciamu [mi   facimu   i lestopitti].*
   now   them=start.1PL MU   make.1PL the lestopitte
   'We start them.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:112)</div>

However, this pronoun refers to the direct object of the embedded verb rather than to the complement clause, as shown by the masculine plural morphology. If we change the pronoun to refer to the complement clause, the result becomes ungrammatical:

(143) a. *#U ncumenciamu [mi facimu i lestopitti].*
      it=start.1PL
      'We start making it.'
   b. **U poti.*
      it=can.3SG
      'He can it.'
   c. *U decidia   [mi fazzu   i lestopitti].*
      it=decide.PST.1SG MI make.1SG the lestopitti
      'I decided it (to make the lestopitti).'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

Neither can complements to *potere* be pronominalised; complements to *decide*, on the other hand, can. This shows that only the latter complement is a full CP.

In Salentino, results are similar. When asked to translate sentences with a pronoun referring to a complement given in the context, the speaker produced the following sentences:

(144) a. *Lu   Marcu òle.*
      the   Marco want.3SG

'Marco decides (it).

b. *La Laura ha   spicciatu cu cconza.*
the Laura have.3SG   finished CU prepares
'Laura has finished preparing (it).'

c. *Lu Vincenzu   pòte.*
the Vincenzo   can.3SG
'Vincenzo can (do it).'

(Sal., Lequile (LE))

In none of these sentences is the pronoun expressed. Note however that the verb embedded under the aspectual verb needs to be repeated. If the absence of the pronoun is taken as a case of pro-drop, we can conclude that pronominalisation is not possible with the complement of aspectual verbs. Ellipsis is however possible with modals and control verbs.

5.11 CP focusing

In a similar vein, we can test whether complements are CPs by fronting them to the left periphery. Arguments of main verbs (DPs and CPs) may be fronted, but complements to modals and aspectuals cannot:

(145) *A NUTÀ   me mparo,   un'âbballà.*
to swim.INF REFL=learn.1SG NEG dance.INF
'I learn to swim, not to dance.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:160)

(146) a. **NUTA   pozzo   / aggia   / saccio   / voglio,   unn'abballà.*
swim.INF can.1SG /have.1SG   /know.1SG / want.1SG   NEG dance.INF
'To swim/swimming I can/have to/know/want, not to dance/dancing.'

b. **A/E/PE   NUTÀ   accumencio / continuo   / fernesco   / sto   / torno*
to/of/for   swim.INF begin.1SG   /continue.1SG /finish.1SG / stay.1SG /return.1SG
unn'abballà.
NEG to/of/for dance.INF
'I begin/continue/stop/am/begin again to swim/swimming, not to dance/dancing.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:160)

In Verbicarese, complements to both *decidǝ* and the functional verb *fǝnì* can be fronted. However, this is impossible with a modal:

(147) a. *'I rǝmanǝ   m'ajǝ   cumbwinda, no   'i partǝ.*
  of stay.INF   REFL=have.1SG convinced   NEG   of leave.INF
  'I decided to stay, not to leave.'

  b. *Cchǝ rǝmangǝ m'ajǝ   cumbwinda, no   cchǝ ppartǝ.*
  that   stay.1SG REFL=have.1SG convinced   NEG   that leave.1SG
  'I decided to stay, not to leave.'

  c. *'I cucinà   ajǝ   fǝnitǝ,   no   'i pulǝzzà*
  of cook.INF   have.1SG   finished,   NEG   of clean.INF
  'I finished cooking, not cleaning.'

  d. **??Guidà   no   pwozzǝ, camǝnà sì.*
  drive.INF   NEG   can.1SG   walk.INF yes
  'I cannot drive, but (I can) walk.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

This test seems to suggest that both *decide* and *fǝnì* take a full clausal complement, in contrast to *putwí*. As with the availability of a focus field discussed in §5.8, the difference between *fǝnì* and *putwí* can be analysed as a difference in phasality. *Fǝnì* selects a phasal complement, and as such the complement can be fronted. In contrast, the complement to *putwí* is non-phasal and can therefore not be fronted.

In Romanian, by contrast, all *să*-complements to different types of verbs can be fronted:

(148) *Să-l citesc,   pot   /încerc /vreau   /hotărăsc /încep   acum!*
  SA=it read.SBJV.1SG, can.1SG /try.1SG /want.1SG   /decide.1SG /start.1SG   now
  'Read it, I can/try/want/decide/start now!'

(Ro.)

Again, this indicates that the *să*-clauses subcategorised by a modal, aspectual or control verb are all CPs.

In Bovese, fronting of the *mi*-complement is marginal and considered 'forced' by our informants. However, there is a difference between different control verbs in that fronting the complement of a conative verb is completely out:

(149) a. *?Mi nnatu   pozzu,   nommi   ballu.*
  MU swim.1SG   can.1SG NEG.MU   dance.1SG

'I can swim, not dance.'

b. ?*Mi nnatu   voliva,   nommi   ballu.*
   MU swim.1SG   want.IPFV.1SG   NEG.MU   dance.1SG

   'I would like to swim, not to dance.'

c. ?*Mi nnatu   mparai,   nommi   ballu.*
   MU swim.1SG   learn.PRET.1SG   NEG.MU   dance.1SG

   'I learned to swim, not to dance.'

d. **Mi nnatu   provu,   nommi   ballu.*
   MU swim.1SG   try.1SG   NEG.MU   dance.1SG

   'I try to swim, not to dance.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(150) *MI SCRIVU   STU LAVURU   ncuminciu/finisciu   [no l'atru]*
      MU write.1SG   this work   begin.1SG/end.1SG   NEG the other

'Writing this work I start/finish, not the other.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC), Squillaci 2016:119)</div>

In Bovese, we witness the same result as in Verbicaro: fronting is possible with the lexical control verbs, although forced. In contrast, it is not possible with a conative verb, but unexpectedly possible with an aspectual. This would substantiate the hypothesis that the phasality of the complement matters. Aspectuals select smaller complements consisting of the vP-phase, whereas conative verbs select slightly bigger clauses which include T-related functional heads, which are not phase-heads, hence fronting is ungrammatical. This however cannot explain the marginal acceptability of fronting with the complement of *pozzu* (149a).

In Salentino, our informants do not like any of the fronted *cu*-complements:

(151) a. **Cu scrivu   stu lavuru   incomenzu, no l'addhu.*
         CU write.1SG   this work   start.1SG,   NEG the other

         'I start writing this work, not the other.'

b. **Cu cuntu   lu dialettu prou,   none l'italianu.*
   CU speak.1SG   the dialect try.1SG NEG   the Italian

   'I try to speak the dialect, not Italian.'

c. **Cu scrivu   lu libru   decidu,   no   cu lu   leggu.*
   CU write.1SG   the book decide.1SG   NEG   CU it=read.1SG

   'I decide to write the book, not to read it.'

d. **Cu scrivu   nnu libru   pòzzu,   none cu mmelu   ccattu.*

    CU write.1SG   a book   can.1SG NEG CU to.me=it=buy.1SG

    'I can write a book, not buy it for myself.'

e. *Cu scrivu   sta fatia spicciu,   none l'aura.*

    CU write.1SG   this work finish.1SG NEG the other

    'I finish writing this work, not the other.'

(Sal.)

Fronting thus seems to suggest that none of these complements are CPs, or they are out for another reason. Therefore, this test is not very informative about the status of Salentino *cu*-complements.

    Fronting of the complement is however possible when the complement is infinitival:

(152) *Cuntare   lu dialettu pozzu,   none l'italianu.*

    speak.INF   the dialect can.1SG, not   the Italian

    'I can speak the dialect, not Italian.'

(Sal., Lequile (LE))

This is unexpected, as *potere* is usually a restructuring verb that takes a complement smaller than CP. This seems to indicate that restructuring is optional in this variety, but more research is needed at this point.

5.12 C-drop

In Standard Italian, complementiser drop can only occur in subjunctive complements or with complements with a verb in the future or conditional (Giorgi & Pianesi 1996; Poletto 2001). However, complementiser drop is not possible in Verbicarese:

(153) *M'ajə   cumbwinda *(cchə) bbajə   a Nnapələ.*

    REFL=have.1SG convinced   that   go.3SG   to Naples

    'I have decided that he should go to Naples.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

Complementiser drop can therefore not be used as a property to distinguish complement types in this variety. The same goes for Romanian and Calabrian. *Să* can never be dropped when

introducing a complement.[19] However, *ca* can always be dropped in colloquial usage (Alexandru Nicolae, p.c.). This seems to indicate that *să* does not behave as a typical C-element. Likewise, Calabrian *mu* can never be dropped.

On the other hand, in some Salentino dialects, the subordinating particle can optionally be dropped. When omitted, *cu* leaves a trace in lengthening of the initial consonant of the following verb (Rohlfs 1969:105; Loporcaro 1997a:346; Mancarella 1998:288; Ledgeway 2012b; 2015a). This 'complementiser-drop' is restricted in some dialects of northern Salento (provinces of Taranto and Brindisi), where *cu* is optionally dropped when there is subject coreferentiality between the matrix and embedded clause (see (58) above). This process takes place most frequently with the verb 'want' (Calabrese 1992:81–2n.8; Vecchio 2010:321). In central-southern Salento, on the other hand, *cu* may be dropped independently of the coreferentiality of the subjects:

(154) *Tocca*   *(cu) mme ndi*   *au*   *te pressa.*
       be.necessary.3SG   (CU) me from.there= go.1SG   of hurry
       'It is necessary that I leave in a hurry.'

                                                 (Sal., Lecce, Ledgeway 2012b:461)

As can be seen in this example, in these varieties the matrix verb does not necessarily have to be 'want'. Indeed, our informant from Lequile allows C-drop with all three predicates under examination:

(155) a. *Pozzu*   *ccuntu*   *lu dialettu.*
         can.1SG   speak.1SG   the dialect
         'I can speak the dialect.'

      b. *Decidu*   *bbau*   *a Lecce.*
         decide.1SG   go.1SG   to Lecce
         'I decide to go to Lecce.'

      c. *Finiscu*   *ppriparu*   *li pasticiotti.*
         finish.1SG   prepare.1SG   the pasticiotti
         'I finish preparing the pasticiotti.'

                                                     (Sal., Lequile (LE))

---

[19] *Să* can however be dropped when used in a main clause (optative/exclamative use), resulting in V-to-C, see (21) and (22) above.

Cu-drop therefore does not differentiate between complements to functional and lexical verbs, and is arguably a phonological rather than syntactic absence of the CP (Ledgeway 2012b). It therefore does not constitute proof that *cu* is a CP in all these complements.

5.13 Conclusions

The results are summarised in table 2:

*Table 2.2 Irrealis complement sizes in USIDs, Romanian, southern Calabrian, & Salentino (A = aspectual, M = modal, L = lexical verb, % = variation, ✓ = grammatical, * = ungrammatical)*

	USID che/inf			Ro. să			SCal. mu			Sal. cu		
Complement type	**A**	**M**	**L**	**A**	**M**	**L**	**A**	**M**	**L**	**A**	**M**	**L**
Future T	*	*	✓	*	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	✓
Perf. Aux.	*	*	*	*	✓	✓	*	-	✓	*	*	✓
Cl. cl	✓	✓	*	✓%	✓%	*	✓	✓	*	✓%	*	*
Neg	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓%	✓%	✓	✓	✓	✓
NPI	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	?	?	*
WH	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	*
LAS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
HAS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tough	✓	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓
Left Per.	*	*	*%	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	✓
Other C	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	*
CP-focus	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	*	✓inf	*
CP pron.	*	*	✓	*	*	*	*	*	✓	*	*	✓
CP extraction	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	*
Particle drop	-	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	✓%	✓%	✓%

As can be seen immediately from this table, the varieties do not pattern alike. Furthermore, the irrealis complementiser within some varieties does not always head complements with the same properties. The notion of 'irrealis complementiser' thus refers to a spurious category and does not represent the same structure cross-linguistically.

In Verbicarese, the modal invariably selects a reduced infinitival complement, which has no independent tense. Restructuring is shown by obligatory negator raising and possible clitic climbing. Furthermore, the left periphery is absent. The non-CP status of the complement of *putwí* is also confirmed by the ungrammaticality of wh-extraction, fronting and pronominalisation of the complement. The presence of the left periphery, on the other hand, could indicate the phasal (i.e. *v*P) status of the complement, which is not the case with *putwí.* Two tests however seem to indicate slightly bigger complements: the possibilty of having some HAS adverbs and independent negation. The latter is not necessarily problematic, if we assume different negation-related heads along the clausal spine. The adverbs seem to indicate that both complements to *putwí* and *fənì* have some functional structure and are bigger than bare VPs. *Decide* on the other hand, selects a

full clausal complement, whether finite or non-finite, with independent tense, independent negation and a fully-fledged left periphery. Clitic climbing is indeed impossible, and all adverbs can occur in the complement clause. The difference between the subjunctive and the infinitival complement has to do with control, as the non-finite complement is necessarily OC.

The Verbicarese data do not comply with the widely accepted analysis, advocated mainly by Ledgeway (2003; 2005; 2006; 2016b), according to which the realis complementiser lexicalises Force, whereas the irrealis complementiser is located in Fin. The irrealis complementiser *ccha* normally precedes topic and focus constituents. I therefore conclude that *ccha* can move to Force to activate the topic and focus fields (cf. Old Italo-Romance varieties as discussed by Ledgeway 2005).

The result of the tests discussed in this section for Romanian seem to confirm that in all *să*-complements there is an IP-layer present, which can host inflection, negation and clitics, as well as perfective auxiliaries. The results of the tests for the CP-layer are contradictory. Whereas wh-elements and complementisers are possible even with modals, the CP does not always block NPI licensing in the lower clause. We can assume that this is partly determined by lexical factors, as in Standard Italian. The tense properties are different for different complement clauses and depend on the selectional restrictions of the main verb. I conclude that all *să*-clauses are CPs, with *să* as the Fin head. A similar conclusion is reached by Nicolae (2016), who argues that *să*-complements to modals are full CPs. The transparency differences can be accounted for in terms of defective phasehood (cf. Alboiu 2006; Gallego 2010). Subjunctive complements constitute defective phases (Gallego 2010:163) and thus allow certain dependencies to take place across phase boundaries.

The Calabrian varieties of Bova Marina and Nicotera do not always pattern alike, as Bovese allows negation in all complements, whereas Nicoterese does not. Second, Bovese allows clitic climbing out of *mu*-clauses, whereas Nicoterese does not. For other tests, the results are the same: both varieties allow focus fronting only with control verbs; they never allow particle drop; and they disallow CP-topicalisation or CP-fronting with modals. We therefore conclude that *mu* is acategorial and can head different sizes of complements, realising *v*-, T- and C-related positions depending on the matrix verb selecting the *mu*-clause.

For Salentino, we do find properties that systematically differ between complement types. Clitic climbing is possible only with restructuring verbs (but with variation across varieties); perfective auxiliaries cannot be used in restructuring contexts; the left periphery is only present for the verbs that select propositional complements; and particle drop is only possible with restructuring verbs. Similarly, the fronting to the left periphery of complements does not seem possible with any *cu*-complement.

Although irrealis complementation across Romance seems very similar at first glance, I conclude that there is a considerable difference between USIDs and Romanian on the one hand,

and Salentino and Calabrian on the other. In Romanian, subjunctives are always FinPs, where ForceP (*ca*) can be optionally realised. In contrast, in Salentino and Calabrian the size of the subjunctive complement depends on the verb that selects it. The CP-layer is not projected when the subjunctive clause is selected by modals or aspectual verbs; it is present instead with control verbs and desideratives. This can be interpreted as a difference in syntactic finiteness: when the complement is a CP, there is greater syntactic autonomy, with independent tense, an independent discourse-related left periphery and the possibility of having non-controlled as well as controlled complements.

6. Subject positions

The position between the embedded verb and *să/cu/mu* is unavailable for the subject, such that the preverbal subject necessarily precedes *să/cu/mu*.[20] In Romanian, the preverbal subject triggers the presence of the complementiser *ca*:

(156) *Vreau   (ca   Ion)   să (*Ion)   vină.*
      want.1SG   that Ion   SA Ion   come.SBJV.3SG
      'I want Ion to come.'

(Ro.)

(157) *Oyyu   lu Maryu   ku (*lu Maryu) bbene   krai.*

---

[20] There are exceptions: some varieties show preverbal subjects following *mu*, such as the dialect of Soveria-Manelli (i), Platania (ii), and Messina (iii):

(i)   *E'   magliu mu 'u nidu   se rende   cchiù comitu.*
      be.3SG better MU the nest   REFL=make.3SG   more comfortable
      'It is better if the nest is made more comfortable.'
                                    (SCal., Soveria-Manelli (CZ), Roberts & Roussou 2002:92n.7)

(ii) *Vɔ'lɛra   mu 'hrati-ta   unn   ɛʃʃɛra.*
      want.COND.1SG MU brother=your   not   kill.COND.3SG
      'I would like for your brother not to kill.'
                                    (SCal., Platania (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005:664)

(iii) *Voli   mi Mariu leggi   u libbru.*
      want.3SG   MU Mario read.3SG the book
      'He wants Mario to read the book.'
                                    (Sic., Messinese, De Angelis 2013:29)

The varieties in (i) and (ii) arguably belong to transitional areas in the northern part of the area characterised by the presence of *mu*-clauses. This is confirmed by other word order deviations, e.g. negation following *mu* (see footnote 6), reduplication of *mu* (Conflenti and Gizzeria, cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005:663-4) or the use of other tenses than the present in the *mu*-clause (Gizzeria, cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005:664). All these properties seem to indicate that in the dialects of this transitional area, *mu* can appear in a higher position than in the other dialects. It might be the case that *mu* appears with syntax of *che* (Roberts & Roussou 2003:92n.7, citing A. Ledgeway).

want.1SG   the Mario   CU the Mario   come.3SG   tomorrow

'I want Mario to come tomorrow.'

(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992:277)

(158) *Vogghiu   lu diavulu   mu (* lu diavulu) ti mangia.*

      want.1SG   the devil   MU   the devil   you=eat.3SG

      'I want the devil to eat you.'

(SCal., Ledgeway 1998:24)

This is not the case for the USIDs,[21] where preverbal subjects precede the irrealis complementiser:

(159) *Libero   vulwera   **cchə** Ccarmela   vənerədə   a Bbrəvacarə.*

      Libero   want.COND.3SG that   Carmela   come.COND.3SG to Verbicaro

      'Libero wants Carmela to come to Verbicaro.'

(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))

In Romanian, Salentino and Calabrian, a postverbal subject position is also available:

(160) *Vreau   să   vină   Ion.*

      want.1SG SA   comes.SBJV.3SG Ion

      'I want Ion to come.'

(Ro.)

(161) *La mamma ole   cu ne   mangia tre   fiusa.*

      the mother want.3SG CU PART=eat.3SG   three son=her

      'The mother wants that her son eats three.'

(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE))

(162) *Vogghiu mi si pigghia   i feri   me soru.*

      want.1SG MU REFL take.3SG the holidays   my sister

      'I want my sister to take time off.'

(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

---

[21] In some ESIDs a preverbal subject triggers the presence of the indicative complementiser *ca,* such as Francovilla Fontana (Vecchio 2010:319); the same is attested with some speakers of Bovese (Squillaci, p.c.). Crucially, however, *cu* and *mu/ma/mi* are always dropped in this case, unlike Romanian *să*.

Interestingly, the most neutral word order in these complements is VOS rather than VSO. For discussion of the structural position of this postverbal subject and how it is derived, see Groothuis (2019).

The preverbal position could be analysed as the 'canonical' position, i.e. what we conventionally call [spec,TP] (cf. AgrSP in Cardinaletti's (2004) overview), or a higher position somewhere in the C(omplementiser) domain of the clause (for instance, TopicP). If the subject is located in [spec,TP], we are forced to conclude that the particle is also located in the I-domain. If on the other hand, the subject is located higher than that, the particle might also be in the C- or I-domain. The position of the subject can therefore shed further light on the question of the clause size of the Balkan-style subjunctive when selected by a lexical control verb. Note that the other two verb classes (aspectuals, modals) do not allow disjoint subjects, and will therefore be left out of the discussion. It will be shown that preverbals subjects are topics rather than 'normal' subjects in [spec,TP], which seems unavailable in these varieties. Data have been collected from two speakers of the dialect of Campi Salentina (LE), Bova Marina (RC) and Romanian.

The preverbal subject position will be tested first by trying to formulate a sentence with a *mu* or *cu* complement where the subject precedes the verb (and thus *mu* and *cu*) and where the object is in FocP (so preceding the verb as well).

(163) [Force [Top∗ [Int [Top∗ [Foc [Top∗ [Mod [Top∗ [Fin [IP ...]]]]]]]]]]

(Rizzi & Bocci 2017:8)

(164) a. *Oiu*   LU VINU RUSSU *cu*   *porta*   *la Carla e*   *none cuiggiu biancu.*
           want.1SG the wine red CU   bring.3SG   the Carla and   NEG   that   white

   b. *Oiu*   *la Carla*   LU VINU RUSSU *(*la Carla) cu porta*   *e none   cuiggiu biancu.*
          want.1SG the Carla   the wine red   the Carla CU bring.3SG   and NEG that   white
      'I want Carla to bring the red wine, not the white one.'

(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE))

Example (164a) shows that there is a focus position preceding *cu* to which an object with contrastive focus can move. (164b) tells us that we can have a subject preceding the focused object (but crucially not following it) and *cu*, which shows that the preverbal subject should not be taken to be in specTP, but in a left-peripheral position. We are therefore forced to conclude that a subject preceding *cu* is a left-periphal subject. If we assume that there is a maximum of one focus position in the left periphery (but cf. Cruschina (2012), who argues for different types of focus), the preverbal subject is a topic (*pace* Calabrese 1992:277-8; cf. Damonte 2011:237; Squillaci 2016:152).

The test with the focalised object does not seem to work in Bovese. No focus fronting of the object is possible in a *mi*-clause, as can be seen in the following example, where it can only occur in a lower focus position and not in the left periphery:

(165) *Nci dissi*   *(*a pasta)*   *mi si mangia*   *a pasta no   a pizza.*
       to.him=say.PRET.1SG the pasta   MU REFL=eat.3SG   the pasta NEG   the pizza
       'I told him to eat the pasta, not the pizza.'

                                           (SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

Even if *mi* changes into *chi*, a preverbal focus position is not available for the object:

(166) **?Voliva*   *c'*   *U VINU RUSSU*   *portavi*   *Carla, no   u   iancu.*
       want.IPFV.1SG that   the wine red   bring.IPFV.3SG Carla NEG   the   white
       'I wish that Carla brought the red wine, not the white one.'

                                           (SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

In Romanian, the preverbal subject can either precede or follow the fronted object:

(167) *Vreau*   *ca (Ana) vinul*   *roşu (Ana) să aducă,*   *nu pe   cel   alb.*
       want.1SG   that Ana wine.DET red   Ana   SA bring.SBJV.3SG   NEG DOM that.one white
       'I want Ana to bring the red wine, not the white one.'

                                                   (Ro.)

When the subject precedes the focused object, it receives a topic interpretation, as in Salentino. Instead, when it follows the object, it is perceived as an information focus, and the object is interpreted as a contrastive topic. Preverbal subjects in Romanian can thus be marked both as a topic and focus.

       Furthermore, if the subject is in a topic position, we expect it to show sensitivity to restrictions on which kinds of DPs can be topicalised (Sheehan 2007). Indeed, non-referential subjects such as 'nobody' or 'somebody' are not acceptable as a preverbal subject:

(168) a. *Oiu*   *ca*   *cuarchetunu catti*   *nu ricalu.*
         want.1SG that   someone   buy.3SG a present
       b. **Oiu*   *cuarchetunu   cu catti*   *nu ricalu.*
         want.1SG someone   CU buy.3SG   a present'
         'I want someone to buy a present.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE))</div>

(169) *Oiu   (*ceddhi)   cu nu   sape   ceddhi   lu segretu miu.*
      want.1SG nobody   CU NEG   knows   nobody   the secret my

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE))</div>

(170) a. **Vogghiu carcunu   mi catta   nu regalu.*
        want.1SG someone   MU buy.3SG a present
        'I want someone to buy a present.'

     b. *Speru   chi   carcunu   u catta   nu regalu.*
        hope.1SG that   someone   it=buy.3SG a present
        'I hope that someone buys a present.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(171) a. *Vogghiu   (*nuddu) non mi   vai   nuddu   a festa*
        want.1SG   nobody   NEG MU   go.3SG   nobody   to party

     b. *Vogghiu chi   nuddu   vai   a festa.*
        want.1SG that   nobody   go.3SG   to party
        'I want that nobody goes to the party.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Bova Marina (RC))</div>

(172) a. *Vreau   ca   cineva   să aducă   vinul   pentru   petrecere.*
        want.1SG   that   somebody   SA bring.SBJV.3SG   wine.DET for   party
        'I want someone to bring the wine for the party.'

     b. *Vreau   vinul roşu   cineva   să-l aducă,   nu pe   cel   alb.*
        want.1SG   wine red   somebody   SA=it bring.SBJV.3SG   not DOM   that.one white
        'I want that someone brings the red wine, not the white one.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

The impossibility of *cuarchetunu* 'someone', *ceddhi* 'nobody', *nuddu* 'nobody' and *carcunu* 'someone' as a preverbal subject of a clause introduced by *cu* and *mi* respectively, confirms our analysis of the embedded preverbal subject being a topic. The sentence can be saved by replacing *mi* with *chi* and *cu* with *ca*, as shown in (170). The finite complementiser *chi* does not pose restrictions on the type of subject unlike *mi*, and licenses the canonical spec,TP preverbal subject position. With *să*-clauses, there is no such restriction, showing once more that the preverbal subject can be both focus and topic.

In Salentino, the preverbal subject position seems dispreferred when the subject is not human; the sentences with *ca* are preferred in these cases. If that is because of the topic-status of

the preverbal position, we expect the postverbal position to be more acceptable, which is indeed the case:

(173) a. ?*Lu pastore   ole   (?le pecure) cu se mangiane   l'erva   (le pecure).*
      the shepherd   want.3SG the sheep   CU REFL=eat3.PL   the grass the sheep
      'The shepherd wants the sheep to eat the grass.'

    b. ?*Mamma ole   (*lu cane)   cu spiccia   te baiare   (lu cane).*
      mother   want.3SG the dog   CU stop.3SG of bark.INF the dog
      'Mother wants the dog to stop barking.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE))</div>

Within the typological literature, a relation between animacy and topicality has been established. Topicality seems to be closely related to animacy (Comrie 1989:199–200). If the subject is located in [spec,TopP] we expect that human subjects are more acceptable than non-human ones and the results given in (173) can be explained. A similar contrast would not be easily accounted for if we assume the subject to be located in [spec,TP].

On the basis of word order evidence and restrictions on the type of subject, it can be concluded that the preverbal subject in a Balkan-style subjunctive is located in a topic or focus position and not in a subject position located in the I-domain (see also Damonte 2011:237; Squillaci 2016:152). The complements which can have a lexicalised preverbal subject are therefore necessarily CPs.

7.   Finiteness and functional structure: conclusions

From a series of tests carried out in §5, it has emerged that the irrealis subordinator or complementiser is a spurious category. Only USID *che/chi* and Romanian *să* can be analysed as regular complementisers, as they occupy ForceP and FinP respectively, independently of the matrix verb that selects them. However, for *cu* and *mu* such a unified analysis cannot be maintained. It has been shown that they occupy a *v*-related position when selected by aspectuals, a T-related position when selected by modals, and FinP when selected by lexical control verbs. This makes the latter two 'complementisers' more similar to the infinitival complementisers *AD/DE,* which can also occupy different positions along the clausal spine.

The main question of this chapter was whether the different degrees of finiteness (i.e. complements to functional/restructuring verbs vs lexical control verb complements) correlate with a difference in clause size. There does indeed seem to be a correlation in the Romance

languages with infinitival complementation headed by AD/DE and Salentino and southern Calabrian. Here, restructured complements are necessarily non-finite and show related properties, such as transparency effects and restricted tense. However, the Romanian data are crucial at this point. Independently of the matrix verb selecting a subjunctive complement, *să* always introduces a CP (at least up until Fin). We are therefore forced to conclude that finiteness does not correlate with clause size cross-linguistically. That the complements of aspectual verbs, modal verbs and lexical control verbs have different degrees of finiteness is shown by the tests which focus on the temporal properties of the verb, as well as transparency tests such as Neg raising. These tests distinguish between three different classes of complements, as shown in Table 2. However, the focus and extraction properties of all these complements invariably show that these are CPs. Across the different Romance varieties, we cannot establish a correlation between finiteness and clause structure. The fact that in Romanian all *să*-complements are of the same size but nonetheless show differences in the level of finiteness, is unexpected given the uniformity principle (Chomsky 2001). One would expect that irrealis non-finite structures selected by a certain class of matrix verbs correspond to the same structures cross-linguistically, contrary to fact.

The results of this chapter raise questions more generally about the syntax-semantics interface. It has been shown that the same semantics need not be mapped onto the same syntactic structure. This is shown for instance by the different realisations of a complement to a modal such as 'can': the meaning does not differ across the languages, but the complement structure does. The complement is reduced in Verbicarese, Salentino and Calabrian. In Romanian, on the other hand, it can be realised both as a FinP/full CP when headed by *să*, or as a *v*P when infinitival (cf. Nicolae 2016). In other Romance languages, where the modal invariably selects an infinitive, the complement is a restructuring (and thus reduced) complement. It thus seems that inactivation of present functional structure or complete absence of functional structure does not lead to any difference at LF.

Within the cartographic approach, specifically, it is assumed that the sequence of functional heads is universal, and partly determined through semantics (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:77). The different realisations of the complement to a modal like 'can' constitute a problem for cartographic enterprises because the same semantics do not map onto the same structure. More specifically, since Cinque's (2004) seminal paper on restructuring, it is thought that functional verbs are directly merged into the inflectional domain and their complement is merged in the lexical domain of the same clause. This is in line with what we have concluded for Salentino and southern Calabrian, but does not account for the Romanian data, where *să*-clauses are invariably CPs. Furthermore, *să*-clauses do not all have the same (morpho)syntactic properties, especially with regards to tense and person licensing. There are a few possible views on the CP-sized *să*-clauses in Romanian. It could be the case that a part of the functional sequence is missing (such as

the heads relating to tense properties), or that the functional heads are present but somehow they have been rendered 'inactive'. This second alternative would be in line with the strong cartographic view (Cinque 2006:4; Cinque & Rizzi 2015:68), according to which the full clausal spine is always projected. Romanian would then be a very antieconomic language, realising a series of functional heads which are inactive or 'unnecessary'. Similarly, it could be proposed that *să* is a syncretic head (Giorgi & Pianesi 1996), lexicalising a series of functional heads, including those that are unavailable or inactive. However, the fact that the adverbs related to most functional heads can be realised would argue against the syncretic view. The conclusion must therefore be that Romanian *să*-clauses are CPs which contain a series of inaccesible heads, rendering them less finite (cf. discussion in chapter 5).

Finally, it has been shown in the last part of the present chapter that the preverbal subject position in the Balkan-style subjunctive is within the CP. The subject is thus always pragmatically marked, and whenever the subject is expressed preverbally, the clause is necessarily a CP. The verb movement and subject positions of the Balkan-style subjunctive and other less finite forms will be discussed further in chapter 4.

3. Changes in finiteness: irrealis complementisers from Latin to Romance

1. Introduction

As discussed in chapter 2, many historical and modern Romance varieties are characterised by the presence of a dual (or multiple) complementiser system, where one of the two (or three) complementisers marks 'irrealis' mood. These irrealis complementisers do not constitute a homogenous group, but rather a spurious category: whereas Romanian *să* consistently lexicalises Fin, Salentino *cu* and southern Calabrian *mu/mi/ma* can appear in different positions along the clausal spine, depending on the matrix verb selecting them. USID *che*, by contrast, can lexicalise Fin and Force depending on the variety. There is thus no cross-linguistic correlation between clause size and finiteness. The present chapter studies the diachrony of these irrealis subordinators. None of these was originally used as such, and in the case of Romanian *să*, Salentino *cu* and southern Calabrian *mu/mi/ma,* their emergence correlates with the replacement of a morphologically non-finite verb form (viz. the infinitive) with a morphologically apparently finite form (viz. the subjunctive). These particular irrealis clauses have been taken to be exponents of different degrees and types of finiteness. The diachrony of the irrealis complementisers is thus closely connected to the diachrony of morphosyntactic finiteness.

For some of these irrealis subordinators, the etymology proves relatively uncontroversial: Ro. *să* is argued to derive from the Latin irrealis SI 'if' (Sandfeld 1930:173; Herman 1963:63; Jordan 2009:25; Nicolae 2015; Zafiu et al. 2016), USID *chi/che* from QUOD/QUID '(because >) that, what' (Rohlfs 1969:188; Ledgeway 2003; 2016b:1018), and Sal. *cu* from QUOD 'that' (Rohlfs 1969:191; Loporcaro 1997a:337; Mancarella 1998). However, the etymology of SCal. *mu/mi/ma* is still a matter of debate (Sorrento 1951:369ff.; Rohlfs 1969:192–3; Ledgeway 1998:20; Roberts & Roussou 2003:88; De Angelis 2013; 2015; Squillaci 2016:170–3). The questions to be explored in this chapter concern the origin of these complementisers and in particular how they developed. Do they show a similar grammaticalisation path, even if they have different sources (viz. adverbs, complementisers)? For the southern Italian complementisers *mu* and *cu* a unified analysis has been proposed, according to which both have QUOMODO 'how' (< QUO 'which.ABL.SG' + MODO 'way.ABL.SG') as their etymological basis, with the former eliding QUO- and the latter -MODO (Bertoni 1905; 1916, *apud* De Angelis 2016:77n.8). This chapter will review and compare the merits of this hypothesis with those of competing hypotheses regarding the etyma of *cu* and *mu*.

A related question that this chapter will address regards the change in the structural position of these complementisers. For instance, *să* comes from Latin *sī* 'if', which was an irrealis and conditional complementiser and therefore presumably occupied a high position within the C-domain (cf. Rizzi (2001) on the position of Italian *se* 'if' as the lexicalisation of the head of IntP between ForceP and FocusP). However, in Modern Romanian it occupies a relatively low position, which has been identified as Fin in the previous chapter. Does the development of the irrealis complementiser present us with a case of downward grammaticalisation, which has been argued to be impossible (Roberts & Roussou 2003)?

Throughout this chapter, complementation patterns will be discussed based on the distinction between three complement types: realis, irrealis, and factive. This is a distinction in *modality* of the complement, which "is concerned with the status of the proposition that describes the event" (Palmer 1986:1). Irrealis modality refers to events that have not (yet) taken place, and irrealis complements are neither presupposed nor asserted. Realis events on the other hand, have or will take place, and realis complements are usually asserted by the speaker or by the main clause subject (Hooper & Thompson 1973). Finally, factive modality indicates that the speaker holds the content of the sentence for a fact and is presupposed by the speaker (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1968; Hooper & Thompson 1973). Crosslinguistically, modality can be marked lexically through complementisers, verbal mood and modal particles (Palmer 1986:4), as well as through syntactic devices such as verb movement or subject positions (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014).

The chapter is structured as follows: first, in §2 an overview of complementation in Classical Latin will be given, after which the changes in later stages of Latin will be discussed. In §3 the diachrony of irrealis complementisers will be described in terms of grammaticalisation paths, starting with Romance varieties that do not have a dual complementiser system. After that, I will discuss the diachrony of USID *che*, Salentino *cu* and southern Calabrian *mu,* and Romanian *să*. §4 concludes the chapter, discussing the changes in finiteness caused by the rise of new irrealis complementation patterns.

2. Complementation in Latin

2.1 Classical Latin

Classical Latin displayed four major types of sentential complementation: clauses with non-finite verb forms (mostly infinitives), finite clauses with factive complementisers and subjunctive complementisers; infinitival complements to functional verbs (§2.1.4); and indirect questions (§2.1.5) (Vincent 1988:66–67; Baños Baños 2009:526–7). These first three types roughly

correspond to realis (§2.1.1), factive (§2.1.2) and irrealis (§2.1.3) complements respectively, but there is no exact one-to-one correspondence, as we shall see below.

2.1.1 Realis complements

The most frequent realis complementation pattern in Classical Latin is the *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* (henceforth *AcI*), i.e. an infinitival clause with accusative-marked subject (Baños Baños 2009: 528), as in (1):

(1) *Omnes   Belgas,   [quam   tertiam esse   Galliae   partem] dixeramus.*
    all.ACC   Belgae.ACC, which.ACC third.ACC be.INF   Gaul.GEN part.ACC say.PLPRF.1PL
    'All the Belgae, which we had said it were a third part of Gaul.'

    (Lat., Caes. *Gall*. 2.1.1)

Its use is typical of those verbs that normally select a proposition (Vincent 1988:67; Bošković 1997:13). The *AcI* is attested mostly (but not exclusively) in *realis* complements: it is frequently subcategorised for especially by declarative and perception verbs (Ernout & Thomas 1953:321; Baños Baños 2009:528).

The infinitive of the *AcI* is marked for aspect and tense (e.g. *amare* 'to love' vs. *amavisse* 'to have loved' vs. *amaturus esse* 'to be about to love'), cf. (2) and (3) (Ernout & Thomas 1953:326; Cuzzolin 1994a; Greco 2008; Baños Baños 2009:529; Jøhndal 2012:61ff.).

(2) *Ait   [venisse   illum in somnis   ad se   mortuom].*
    say.PRF.3SG   come.PRF.INF   he.ACC in dreams.ABL to REFL   dead.ACC
    'S/he said that dead one had come to him in his sleep.'

    (Lat., Pl. *Mos*. 490, *apud* Jøhndal 2012:62)

(3) *Is ait   [se   mihi   allaturum   cum argento   marsuppium].*
    he say.PRF.3SG REFL.ACC me.DAT   bring.PTC.FUT with money.ABL   wallet.ACC
    'He said he would bring the wallet with the money.'

    (Lat., Pl. *Men*. 1043, *apud* Jøhndal 2012:62)

The expression of the subject in an *AcI* is obligatory according to prescriptive grammars. It is indeed more frequent than the nominative subject in a finite subordinate clause, partly to mark the clause as subordinate, as it is not marked by an overt complementiser (Ernout & Thomas 1953:322; Cecchetto & Oniga 2002; Baños Baños 2009:529; Ledgeway 2012a:157). However, the

subject can be dropped when the context allows for the correct interpretation (Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:362). Jøhndal (2012: 64) reports statistics according to which pro drop occurs in around 30% of *AcI*s in early Latin and is more likely when the predicate features agreement (e.g. on participles (cf. De Melo 2007)). When it is coreferential with the matrix verb, the accusative subject is usually expressed by a reflexive pronoun (see e.g. (3)). The *AcI* is thus used in uncontrolled sentences, as the subject can but need not coincide with the matrix subject.

Finally, a finite clause headed by *quod* (typically used as a factive complementiser, cf. §2.1.2) is also found with realis complements selected by *verba dicendi* and *sciendi*, albeit quite rarely and in colloquial style (Baños Baños 2009:550). As will be discussed below in §2.2, more cases begin to appear with post-classical writers.

2.1.2   Factive complements

Some types of finite complement clause are introduced by the erstwhile causal conjunctions *quod* or *quia,* 'because (of the fact that), that', which were originally the neuter singular of the relative pronoun and the neuter plural of the interrogative pronoun, respectively, but which developed into factive complementisers. They can substitute the *AcI* introducing several types of complements in Classical Latin (Ernout & Thomas 1953:294; Vincent 1988:67; Pinkster 1990:71; Cuzzolin 1994a; 1994b; Baños Baños 2009:552–56). In these complements, the verb can appear both in the indicative and subjunctive (Ernout & Thomas 1953:298). *Quod* is more frequent than *quia*, which is still very rare as a complementiser in Classical Latin (Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:577). An example of a factive complement headed by *quod* is given in (4):

(4)   *Sane   gaudeo   quod te   interpellavi.*
        indeed rejoice.1SG that   you.SG.ACC interrupt.PRF.1SG
        'I am indeed happy that I have interrupted you.'

                                                            (Lat., Cic. *Leg*. 3.1)

With factive verbs, the *quod*-clause is ambiguous between a complement and an adjunct: the complement clause expresses the cause of the feeling expressed by the matrix verb. In fact, in the earliest cases, the *quod*-complement is part of a proleptic construction (cf. Cuzzolin 1994a:43) in conjunction with a matrix-clause demonstrative:

(5)   **haec**   *spectans,*   **quod** *angusta*   *re*   *frumentaria*   *utebatur,*
      this.PL.ACC looking.at   that   short.ABL   thing.ABL of.corn   use.PASS.IPFV.SBJV.3SG,
      quodque *Pompeius*   *multitudine*   *equitum*   *ualebat.*
      that=and   Pompeius.NOM multitude.ABL knights.GEN be.strong.IPFV.3SG

'Viewing this, that he had a small amount of corn, and that Pompeius was strong in

cavalry.'

(Lat., Caes. *Civ*. 3.43.3, *apud* Adams 2005:196)

Apart from a finite complement, factive verbs can also select an *AcI*, as in (6), or a bare infinitival complement (the so-called *prolative* infinitive, see (7)):

(6) *Saluom   te   advenire   gaudeo.*
     healty.ACC you.ACC arrive.INF   rejoice.1SG
     'I rejoice that you arrive safe and sound.'

(Lat., Plaut. *Bacch*. 456, *apud* Baños Baños 2009:525)

(7) *Ab   quivis homine.. beneficium   accipere   gaudeas.*
     from   any   man.ABL service.ACC accept.INF   rejoice.SBJV.2SG
     'You would be glad to accept a service from any man.'

(Lat., Ter. *Ad*. 254 *apud* Ernout & Thomas 1953:258)

However, already in Classical Latin, finite complements are more frequent with factive verbs than the *AcI* (Ernout & Thomas 1953:297; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:579; Baños Baños 2009:552). The fact that the *AcI* could also be used here shows that the *AcI* is not dependent on the meaning of the matrix verb: assertion, factivity or (ir)realis modality do not play a role. It is thus the most versatile and least marked complementation structure in Classical Latin.

2.1.3   Irrealis complements

There are two types of finite irrealis complement clauses (Ernout & Thomas 1953:299–300; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:644–47; Baños Baños 2009:536–37): consecutive clauses, introduced by *ut*, whose negative counterpart is *ut non*, and final clauses headed by *ut* or its negative counterpart *ne*. *Ut* and *ne* can also head an adjunct clause with the same final and consecutive meanings. The first type of complement introduced by *ut* follows impersonal, one-place verbs (Baños Baños 2009:536). The second, much more frequent type appears mostly with verbs selecting an irrealis complement. The distinction is justified both syntactically and semantically, as can be seen in the negative counterparts for these complements. Both types are followed by a verb in the subjunctive.

Ut can be dropped (Ernout & Thomas 1953:300; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:530; Pinkster 1990:125; Baños Baños 2009:541–44), which is considered by some a trace of an older paratactic

stage (Ernout & Thomas 1953:300; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:530). However, Baños Baños (2009: 541ff.) convincingly argues against a paratactic analysis of the subjunctive complements without *ut*, since the phenomenon is very frequent throughout the history of Latin and in many of its daughter languages, e.g. Italian, Salentino (see chapter 2). This C(omplementiser)-drop is found after irrealis verbs expressing desire or orders, or deontic impersonal verbs or the imperative *fac* 'do!':

(8)   *Tu*   *uellem*   *ego*   *uel*   *cuperem*   *adesses.*
        you.NOM   want.SBJV.1SG   I.NOM or   wish.SBJV.IPFV.1SG   be.present.SBJV.IPFV.2SG
        'You, I wish, or better, I desire, to be here.'
                                            (Lat., Cic. *Att.* 2,18,4 *apud* Baños Baños 2009:541)

C-drop is not attested with impersonal factive verbs selecting *ut* or factive verbs selecting *quod* (Baños Baños 2009:542). This is reminiscent of the situation found in Standard Romance, where *que/che* can only be dropped when it heads an irrealis complement clause with a verb in the subjunctive, future or conditional.

      Complement clauses introduced by *ut* look very similar to final and consecutive adjuncts because they are headed by the same element. However, they differ syntactically as complements are selected, whereas adjuncts are not. Second, *ut* can only be dropped when it heads a complement clause, but not an adjunct (Pinkster 1990:125). Third, in the case of a complement clause, the embedded subject must be controlled by a matrix argument. This restriction does not hold for adjuncts introduced by *ut* (Pinkster 1990:125; Baños Baños 2009:539).

      Irrealis complements can also be morphologically non-finite, taking the form of an *AcI*:

(9)   *Caesar [ex castris*   *equitatem*   *educi]*   *iubet.*
        Caesar out camps.ABL   cavalry.ACC   lead.out.INF.PASS   order.3SG
        'Caesar orders the cavalry to be led out of the camps.'
                                             (Lat., Caes. *Gall.* 7,13,1 *apud* Baños Baños 2009:528)

In some cases, however, the choice between an *AcI* and a finite complement causes a change in meaning from realis to irrealis, as, e.g., with verbs of saying, which can be followed by an *AcI* when they have declarative, propositional meaning, but also by *ut* and a verb in the subjunctive mood when they have a jussive, irrealis interpretation:

(10)   a.   *Thales [...]*   *aquam*   *dixit*   *esse*   *initium*   *rerum.*
             Thales   water.ACC   say.PRF.3SG   be.INF   beginning.ACC   things.GEN
             'Thales said that water was the origin/beginning of everything.'

(Lat., Cic. *Nat. deor.* 1.25 *apud* Baños Baños 2009:525)

b. *Dicam   tuis,   ut   eum,   si uelint,   describant.*
say.FUT.1SG yours.DAT   that   him.ACC if want.SBJV.3PL describe.SBJV

'I will tell your men to describe him, if they wish.'

(Lat., Cic. *Fam.* 12.17.2 *apud* Baños Baños 2009:525)

In general, many Latin verbs allow a range of different types of complements (cf. Baños Baños 2009:525; Horrocks 2011:134-137 for examples).

Finally, when selected by control verbs, the irrealis complement clause can be instantiated by an infinitive. This use of the infinitive as a verbal complement is traditionally referred to as the *prolative* infinitive (Vincent 1988:69; Horrocks 2011:138). Within this category however, a distinction needs to be drawn between verbs that select infinitival CP-complements (control verbs) and those which subcategorise for reduced infinitival complements (modal, aspectual and raising verbs). Infinitival complements therefore do not form a homogeneous category in Latin, as in Romance. An example of a control verb with an infinitival complement is given in (11):

(11) *Et [...] promisit   regem   venenis   necare.*
and   promise.PRF.3SG   king.ACC poison.ABL.PL kill.INF

'And s/he promised to kill the king with poison.'

(Lat., *Gel.* 3.8.1)

These infinitival complements to raising and control verbs differ from the *AcI* in that the subject of the former is also an argument of the matrix clause, whereas the subject of the *AcI* receives its theta-role from the embedded infinitive only. This results in different passivisation properties and restrictions on the type of the event in case of control infinitives but not with *AcI*-selecting verbs (Vincent 1988:67; Pinkster 1990:126–131; Baños Baños 2009:531). The two might however be historically related, as the object control structure, in which the infinitival subject is interpreted as the matrix object, marked accusative, has been reanalysed as an *AcI*, where that subject is an argument of the embedded infinitive (Ernout & Thomas 1953:320; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:353; Baños Baños 2009:530; Horrocks 2011:139; Jøhndal 2012:68). See Cuzzolin (1994a:36–42) for discussion of this and other hypotheses.

2.1.4   Complements to functional and raising verbs

The bare infinitive is used as a complement to a range of verbs, comprising both functional (12) and lexical verbs (§2.1.3) (Ernout & Thomas 1953:320; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:346–7; Jøhndal

2012:51ff.). Functional verbs that select reduced infinitival complements include modals such as *volo* 'want', *possum* 'be able' (12) and raising verbs such as *videor* 'seem' (13) (Jøhndal 2012:51ff.):

(12) *"at quoniam coniunx mea   non   potes   esse, arbor   eris*
      but because wife.NOM mine.NOM   NEG   can.2SG be.INF tree.NOM   be.FUT.2SG
      certe"   dixit   "mea".
      certainly   say.PRF.3SG mine
      '"But if you cannot be my wife, as a tree you will be definitely mine," he said.'

                                                                      (Lat., Ovid. *Met.* 1.556)

(13) *Omnes   videntur   scire [...]*
      all.NOM.PL see.PASS.3PL know.INF
      'Everyone seems to know.'

                                                      (Lat., Pl .*Cist.* 112, *apud* Jøhndal 2012:64)

The matrix verb restricts the temporal reference of its complement, which is reflected in the almost complete lack of non-present infinitival forms (except for morphological perfectives, such as *novi* 'I know' (cf. Jøhndal 2012:64)). Apart from restrictions on tense, these complements are also restricted in their subjects since, due to their nature as raising verbs, the embedded subject necessarily coincides with the matrix subject.

2.1.5   Indirect interrogatives

In Classical Latin, indirect questions typically contain a verb in the subjunctive, although the indicative is attested as well in *wh*-questions (Baños Baños 2009:527–8). In the case of a simple yes/no-question, the question usually contains the interrogative particles *num* or *an*. Complex questions which propose two possible answers feature the particles *utrum ... an*, 'whether ... or'. *Wh*-questions, on the other hand, are introduced by the *wh*-element exactly as in direct questions. As will be discussed below, all the indirect interrogative particles will be replaced by *si* 'if' in later stages of Latin, which happens occasionally already in Classical Latin (Martín Puente 2009:662).

2.2   Developments in late Latin

In the transition from Latin to Romance, the complementation and complementiser systems change quite radically. The beginnings of these changes can already be seen in late Latin: the *AcI* becomes less frequent, increasingly replaced by finite complements (§2.2.1); furthermore, *ut*

completely disappears (§2.2.2). This section will describe those developments in late Latin that will be relevant for the emergence of the Romance irrealis complementiser system.

2.2.1 Loss of the *AcI* and extension of the finite complementation

As noted in §2.1.2, the *AcI* was sometimes substituted by a finite clause introduced by *quod* or *quia*, even after epistemic and declarative verbs, the most prototypical and practically obligatory contexts of the *AcI*. This becomes more general in late Latin (Ernout & Thomas 1953:298–299; Herman 1963:32–37; Väänänen 1963:162; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:578–9; Adams 2005; Adams 2011:280–81; Adams 2013; Horrocks 2011:281). In fact, in post-classical authors we find various examples of subordinate finite clauses introduced mostly by *quod* or *quia*, but also by *quoniam* or *quomodo* (Herman 1963: 32ff). The earliest examples occur in Classical Latin with *quod*. Plautus' *Asinaria* 52 is often cited as the first example of *quod* after *verba dicendi* and *sciendi* (Löfstedt 1911:117; Väänänen 1963:62; Herman 2000:88,[1] as well as an example from the *Bellum hispaniense* (Ernout & Thomas 1953:299; Horrocks 2011:281; Greco 2008:17):

(14) *Equidem scio   iam   filius   quod amet   meus   istanc*
     well   know.1SG already son.NOM that loves.SBJV.3SG mine.NOM that.ACC
     meretricem.
     prostitute.ACC
     'Well, I already know that my son loves that prostitute.'

     (Lat., Plautus *Asin*. 52)

(15) *Dum   haec   geruntur,   legati Carteienses   renuntiaverunt*
     while these.PL.NOM carry.out.PASS.3PL legates from.Carteia announce.PRF.3PL
     quod Pompeium   in potestatem haberent.
     that   Pompeius.ACC in power.ACC   have.SBJV.3PL
     'While these things happened, the legates from Carteia have announced that they had Pompei in their power.'

     (Lat., *Bellum Hispaniense* 36,1)

Petronius documents the first example of complements with *quia* (Baños Baños 2009:554):

---

[1] Not everyone agrees, see Baños Baños 1998 for an alternative analysis of this sentence, according to which *quod amet* is to be interpreted as an idiomatic expression meaning 'loved one'.

(16) *Dixi   quia mustella   comedit.*
    say.PRF.1SG   that   weasel.NOM eat.PRF.3SG
    'I said that a weasel ate them.'

                        (Lat., Petron. 46,4, *apud* Baños Baños 2009:525)

The use of *quia* emerged later than *quod*, starting with Petronius; *quoniam* appears from the 2nd century A.D. onwards (Adams 2011:280). These causal conjunctions are used as complementisers by analogy with *quod*, which had this function already in Republican times.

    Quomodo also acquires the function of introducing complements following declarative and epistemic verbs such as *dico* 'I say' and *scio* 'I know' (cf. similar developments described by Willis (2007), Legate (2010) and Van Gelderen(2015)), but it does so relatively late, with the first examples going back to the 4th century. The majority of examples are found in authors inspired by Greek texts or translations from Greek (Löfstedt 1911:117; Herman 1963:44). A nuance of manner however remains, as can be seen in the following examples:

(17) *videte,   quomodo   spiritius   sanctus tamquam   ex sonu   unius*
    see.2PL,   how   spirit.NOM   holy.NOM as.if   out sound.ABL one.GEN
    vocis   dicit.
    voice.GEN   say.3SG
    'You see, how the holy spirit speaks as if with a sound from one voice.'

               (Lat., *Didascalia Apostolorum* 52,21, *apud* Tekavčić 1980:605)

(18) *Viderunt   oculi   tui,   quomodo   tradidit   te   dominus.*
    see.PRF.3PL   eyes.NOM your.NOM,   how   hand.over.PRF.3SG you.ACC lord.NOM
    'Your eyes have seen how the lord has handed you over.'

                (Lat., *Optat.* 3, 10 *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

When the verb does not express interrogation but has a more declarative nature, an interrogative indirect clause has a very similar meaning as a complement clause (Herman 1963:45):

(19) *responderunt... quomodo   similis   arteriarum cordis   est   motus.*
    reply.PRF.3PL   how   similar.NOM arteries.GEN heart.GEN be.3SG   movement.NOM
    'They replied ... how the movement of the arteries in the heart is similar.'

               (Lat., Caelius Aurelianius (II.181), *apud* Herman 2000:89)

    The use of a finite clause instead of an *AcI* only became dominant towards the end of the Empire, with the turning point being identified as 500 AD (Herman 2000:89; Wright 2011:77).

Hence, it comes as no surprise that the use of *quod* continues into many Romance varieties, as well as that of *quia* in southern Italo-Romance.

The pathway of this replacement is described by Cuzzolin (1994a; 1994b): the number of occurrences of the *AcI* started decreasing, although gradually and slowly, firstly with factive predicates, then non-assertive predicates, later semifactive predicates and finally strong assertives. The weak-assertive and non-assertive predicates changed only in a very late period, which could also be considered Romance. Indeed, it is claimed that the *AcI* never completely disappears from Latin texts (Löfstedt 1911:116; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:576; Cuzzolin 1994a:33; Adams 2005). There is thus a stage in which *quod*-clauses and *AcI* alternate. There are two factors influencing the choice between both options (Herman 1989). Whenever the complement clause appears before the main verb, the *AcI* is practically the only possibility. VO becomes the prevalent word order, in some styles it is even exclusively used, which leads to a diminution of obligatory *AcI,* as will be discussed below. The second factor is topicality: the probability of the occurrence of a *quod/quia* clause is highest where the agent of the subordinate clause is not a topic.

Various hypotheses for the cause of the replacement of the *AcI* with finite complementation have been proposed. For instance, *quod* after epistemic and declarative verbs has been argued to be a Graecism (see e.g. Väänanen 1963: 162). However, this is not very convincing, as the use of *quod* with *verba affectuum* (factive verbs) was established from the very earliest texts before Latin came into contact with Greek (Cuzzolin 1994a; Baños Baños 2009:554–5; Clackson & Horrocks 2009:255–6). It could have easily been extended to other types of complements. Furthermore, the presence of a proleptic construction with a neuter pronoun that is explained by a relative *quod,* as in *hoc credo quod veniet* 'I believe this, that he comes', will have contributed to the extension of the *quod*-complement to other verbs types (Herman 1963; Cuzzolin 1994a; Adams 2005; 2011:280–281; 2013:743–45).

Following Ledgeway (2012a:238–249), I assume that the transition from the *AcI* to finite complementation is connected to a deeper, structural change: the shift from head-finality to head-initiality. Head-final orders are derived by roll-up movement, a structural operation that moves a complement to a specifier position. There are limitations on possible word order combinations: a head-initial order may select either a head-initial or head-final order, but a head-final phrase can only take a head-final complement (the Final-over-Final-Condition (FOFC), (cf. a.o. Biberauer, Holmberg & Roberts 2008; Biberauer, Holmberg & Roberts 2014; Sheehan et al. 2017). If we apply this to diachronic change in word order from head-final to head-initial (i.e. the loss of roll-up movement), we predict that this change has to occur top-down, from the C-domain to the V-domain (Ledgeway 2012a:238–239). The archaic pattern of the *AcI*, which was head-final with a phonologically empty complementiser (Cecchetto & Oniga 2002), favoured harmonic roll-up, and

was therefore replaced by the 'innovative', head-initial *quod/quia* complementation pattern. The rise of finite complementation, which is head-initial, at the expense of the head-final structure of the *AcI* is thus connected to this broader change.

The so-called prolative infinitive does continue in complements to raising and control verbs in Romance, but in many cases, infinitival complementisers derived from AD and DE have emerged; the choice of the complementiser seems highly idiosyncratic (Ledgeway 2016b:1016), as will be discussed in §3.3 below. The bare infinitive continues with fewer verbs and shows a greater level of clause union than in Latin, giving rise to restructuring phenomena such as clitic climbing, auxiliary switch and the long passive in Romance (Rizzi 1982:chap. I; Vincent 1988:69).

2.2.2 Loss of *ut*

As noted in §2.1.3, *ut* was very frequently employed as a general future-oriented, irrealis complementiser. However, *ut* becomes less frequent and is eventually lost in Romance[2] (Vincent 1988: 68), even though there is almost no Latin text that does not feature *ut* (Herman 1963:57). The main reason for the loss of *ut* is probably of a phonological nature: final consonants, especially –T, were lost. This transforms *ut* into *[u], a very weak element that is highly likely to disappear. Also at a semantic level, *ut* had become weak, being an unmarked complementiser (Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:632,646). This is supported by the fact that already in late Latin we see pleonastic uses of *ut,* where, following its bleaching, it is combined with other complementisers:

(20) a. *illud nobis*   *propositum est*   *ut,*   *quoniam nos*   *impios ..*
this to.us.DAT   proposed   be.3SG   that,   that   us.ACC   irreverent.ACC
vocatis ..   *demonstrare*
you.call.2PL show.INF
'This has been proposed to us, that you say that we show us irreverent.'

                (Lat., *Arnob. Nat.* 4,130, *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

b. *persuaserunt*   *sibi*   *... ut, quia*
convince.PRF.3PL   REFL.DAT ... that, that
'They convinced themselves that'

             (Lat., Claud. Don. *Aen.* 7,45 p. 12, 11ff., *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

c. *Quoniam oportet*   *vobis*   *scribere ut, quoniam... ,*   *videntur*   *ergo*

---

[2] The only traces of *ut* in Romance would be if we assume, following Roberts & Roussou (2003:94), Cal. *mu* from MODO UT (but see below); another supposed trace of UT is the Aromanian final complementiser *ta si* 'in order to', which is claimed to derive from UT, SI. This seems unlikely as this particle has the morphological variant *tra* (M. Mavrogiorgos, p.c.). However, some Calabrian varieties have *ute/uti* for 'how?' (Meyer-Lübke 1935:758). Crucially, the complementiser *ut* does not survive into Romance.

because be.necessary.3SG you.DAT.PL write.INF that, because ..., see.PASS.3PL thus

mihi   abluisse..   delictum.

me.ABL   wash.away.INF.PRF   offence.ACC

'Because you should write so that they seem thus to remove the offence off me.'

(Lat., Cypr. *Epist*. 23 p. 536, 12, *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

In late Latin, final or consecutive *ut* is actually replaced by various C-elements, such as *quo* 'where, when', *quod* 'that', *quoniam* 'because, whereas', *quomodo* 'how' (Herman 1963:53; Meyer-Lübke 1899:640; Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:632):

(21) *Inde..   illa   impatientia ... erupit,   quod   vos   nulla regionum*

thence   that   impatience   erupt.PRF.3SG   that   you.PL.ACC   no   regions.GEN

longinquitas ... morari   potuit.

distance.NOM   delay.INF   can.PRF.3SG

'Thence that impatience burst out, so that no distance to regions could hold you back.'

(Lat., Paneg. 3(11), 8,1, *apud* Hofmann Szantyr 1972:582)

(22) *Columbaria   singula   esse oportet,   ut os   habeat*

nest.NOM   singular.NOM   be.INF be.necessary.3SG so mouth.ACC   have.SBJV.3SG

(Columba),   quo modo   inoire   et   exire   possit.

dove.NOM   how   enter.INF and   exit.INF can.SBJV.3SG

'Every nest needs to be [like this], so that it has a mouth for (the dove) to be able to enter and exit.'

(Lat., Varro *Rust*. 3, 7,4 *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

With late Latin writers, we see a considerable extension of the use of *quomodo* (Herman 1963:58)*.* It replaces *ut* and *cum* in more and more functions, especially in their function as *wh*-elements, viz. 'how', 'as' (Herman 2000: 91). *Quomodo* was synonymous with *ut* as a wh-element and was therefore also easily extended to replace *ut* in other contexts, including as a complementiser (Herman 1963:45). Given these tendencies, and the phonological developments, it is unsurprising that *ut* does not survive into Romance. *Quomodo*, on the other hand, survives across most (if not all) Romance varieties as a *wh*-element, and in many as a final and/or temporal complementiser (see §3.5.2).

2.2.3   Emergence of *que*

From the seventh century onwards, *que,* sometimes written as *quae*, probably pronounced as [ke], appears in all the major regions of the Western Romània as a general subordinator. The majority of these forms are found in Merovingian texts of France, but it is also attested in northern Italy and more rarely in the Iberian peninsula (Väänänen 1963:162). The use of *que* as a general complementiser is identical to the late Latin use of *quod*; it can also appear where we would expect *ut* in Classical Latin. At the same time, *que* seems equivalent to *quod* and *quia* as causal complementisers, as it can mark causal meaning. It is not surprising that *que*, which substitutes *quod*, has replaced *quia* as well in some varieties, since *quia* and *quod* overlapped in causal contexts and as a complementiser with epistemic and declarative verbs (Herman 1963:125).

   The exact etymology of *que* is unclear. Various different proposals have been put forth: QUID, QUOD, QUIA (via QUI) or a merger of QUIA/QUEM (cf. Herman 1963:125ff. for an overview). The last two etyma are to be rejected on the basis of facts that that point towards an etymon with a final [d]. First, forms with the final consonant are attested in older varieties, such Old Tuscan *ched,* attested in prevocalic position, and Old French *quet/qued* (Godefroy 1982:493), or Provençal *quez* (Meyer-Lübke 1899:608). Second, even if the final consonant is no longer directly visible in modern varieties such as Standard Italian, it does leave traces in the form of *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* (cf. Loporcaro 1997b). More arguments against positing QUIA as the etymon of *que* are the phonological improbability of the loss of final [a], the most resilient of final unstressed vowels, and the fact that QUIA survives as *ca* in many southern Italian varieties, where it contrasts with *che*.

   This leaves us with QUOD and QUID. Phonologically, QUID seems the most probable; however, there is very little evidence of Latin *quid* being used in the place of what had become the general complementiser *quod*. It has been argued that Italian *che* is the result of the merger of *quid* and *quod*, which are both neuter singulars of relative C-elements, which could easily have been confused (Meyer-Lübke 1899:609, 624, 640; Herman 1963; Rohlfs 1969:188; Vincent 1988; Ledgeway 2006:123). Which form exactly has given *que/che* is in the end a purely hypothetical issue – here a hypothetical element *[ke(d)], which functions both as a relative element and a complementiser, will be posited as the etymon of Romance *que/che*.

2.3 Complementation in Latin: conclusions

The discussion of this section can be summarised by Table 1, where '++' is to be understood as 'very frequent', '+' as 'frequent', '-' as 'uncommon', and '--' as 'not or rarely attested':

Table 3.1 Complementation patterns in Classical Latin (CL) and late Latin (LL)

	Inf. TP/vP		Inf. CP		AcI		QUOD		QUIA		UT		QUOMODO	
	CL	LL	CL	LL	CL	LL	CL	LL	CL	LL	CL	LL	CL	LL
Realis	--	--	-	-	++	+	-+	++	+/-	++	--	--	--	+
Irrealis	+	+	++	++	+	+	--	++	--	--	++	+	--	++
Factive	--	--	+	+	+	-	++	++	--	-	--	--	--	
Functional	++	++	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Questions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	++	--	++	++

Looking at the distribution of complementation patterns in Classical and late Latin, we note immediately that one of the most important complementation patterns in Classical Latin was the *AcI*, especially in realis contexts, but also in factive and irrealis complements, which however disappears almost completely in Romance. In late Latin we see its decline and how it is increasingly replaced by finite clauses which are headed most frequently by *quod* and later also *quia*, but also to a lesser extent by *quoniam* and *quomodo*. Whereas *quod* and *quia* introduce mainly factive complements in Classical Latin, *quod* becomes a more unmarked option in later Latin (leading to general Romance *que/che*).

Another frequent complementiser that disappears completely in Romance is the irrealis complementiser *ut* and its negative counterpart *ne*. In late Latin we see that *ut* is replaced mostly by *quod* and *quomodo*. Where Classical Latin marks irrealis on both the embedded verb (in the subjunctive) and on the complementiser, in late Latin a general complementiser *quod* is the most frequent, which can introduce both factive, realis and irrealis complements; as such, it is followed by both indicative and subjunctive complements.

The marking of factive complements and indirect questions has remained relatively stable throughout the history of Latin. Factive complements tend to be introduced mostly by *quod* in both Classical and late Latin; the *AcI* also appears in Classical Latin but its decrease in use starts with factive complements. Factive complements in Romance contain subjunctive verb forms in many Romance languages, but not in those which present Balkan-style complementation. Some SIDs present dedicated factive complements (Colasanti 2018b).

The use of the infinitive as a complement to functional verbs has remained quite stable in the transition from Latin to Romance (with the exception of Modern Romanian and the dialects of the extreme south of Italy). However, functional verbs and their complements have become increasingly interlaced, giving rise to restructuring phenomena (Rizzi 1982:chap. I; Vincent 1988:69). With some infinitives, both in complements to functional and lexical verbs, the use of an infinitival complementiser *DE/AD* arises (and will become obligatory in Romance with certain (but not all) of these, cf. §3.3 below). AD tends to be used for future-oriented complements,

whereas DE arises as a structural parallel with *QUOD* (Vincent 1988:69; Ledgeway 2016b:1015–16).

Among Latin C-elements, all Romance languages kept, in some way or other, *si, quando* and *quomodo* (Herman 1963:20). The most frequent complementation pattern of Classical Latin, the *AcI*, is lost in all contexts in Romance; later learnèd borrowings are structurally quite distinct from the original *AcI* (Vincent 1988:68; Pountain 1995; Bošković 1997; Clackson & Horrocks 2009:281–282). There is also increasing use of *si* as an interrogative complementiser, which might have been influenced by Greek (Herman 1963:63; Herman 2000:93).

3.   Grammaticalisation paths: irrealis complements from Latin to Romance

3.1   Theoretical background

This section will discuss the grammaticalisation process that the irrealis complementisers have undergone from Latin to Romance. Grammaticalisation can be defined as a process whereby new grammatical elements are formed from lexical items already present in the language (Meillet 1912; Harris & Campbell 1995; Heine & Kuteva 2002; 2007; Roberts & Roussou 2003; Van Gelderen 2004; Narrog & Heine 2017). This type of diachronic change often leads to semantic bleaching and phonological reduction of the element undergoing grammaticalisation. In the context of the irrealis complementisers and subordinating particles of Romance, we are dealing with a specific subtype of grammaticalisation, as the elements undergoing grammaticalisation (QUOD/QUID > *che*, QUOMODO > *cu*, *mu* and SI > *să*) are already grammatical elements belonging to the C-domain in Latin. It is therefore more correct to speak about 'secondary grammaticalisation' (although this might not be a fundamentally different process than grammaticalisation proper, cf. e.g. Breban 2014).

Two economy principles play a role in the process of grammaticalisation: the Head over Phrase principle, according to which it is more economical for language-acquiring children to posit a head than a phrase (Van Gelderen 2004:11; 2009), and the Merge over Move principle (Roberts & Roussou 2002; cf. also Van Gelderen's (2009) Late Merge Principle), which states that it is less costly to merge an element in a higher position than to move it there from a lower position within the tree. Generally, we see specifiers reanalysed as heads, when grammaticalising; second, heads will be merged directly into higher positions in the tree rather than being moved there. In fact, Roberts and Roussou (2003) claim that grammaticalisation is always 'upward' in the syntactic tree: through reanalysis, elements can occupy a higher position in the syntactic derivation, moving from a lexical to a functional head, but never in the opposite direction ('downwards'). This is in line with the idea that grammaticalisation is a unidirectional process:

grammatical elements rarely become lexical (though see Willis 2017). However, as will emerge from the remainder of this chapter, most of our irrealis subordinating particles seem to constitute counterexamples to the generalisation that elements grammaticalise 'upwards', and instead appear in lower positions in the clause than before (cf. discussion in §3.7).

From a typological perspective, a number of generalisations have been proposed regarding the grammaticalisation of 'subordinators'. Generally, their grammaticalisation follows the cline of parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination, where 'hypotaxis' refers to loosely connected sentences, whereas a subordinate clause is dependent on the matrix clause (Hopper & Traugott 2003:177). The grammaticalisation of subordinators usually shows the following characteristics:

(23)   a. Wherever there is appropriate historical evidence, subordinators are derived from lexical and other linguistic material serving purposes other than that of clause subordination.

b. When a new subordinator arises, this entails desemanticisation, that is, the marker gradually loses its earlier lexical or other function in favour of its new function of signalling clause subordination.

c. In the transition from non-subordinator to subordinator there is a stage of ambiguity, in that the marker concerned can simultaneously be interpreted with reference to both its earlier and its new function.

d. With its desemanticisation, the subordinator loses morphosyntactic properties characteristic of its earlier grammatical status, being increasingly reduced to marking syntactic relations between clauses (decategorialisation).

e. In addition to external there also may be internal decategorialisation: if the marker is morphologically complex it will lose this complexity and turn into a non-compositional, invariable form.

f. The subordinator may be phonetically and/or prosodically reduced (erosion).

(Narrog & Heine 2017:10)

However, although the traditional idea that hypotaxis derives from parataxis might be true for the very first instance of clausal embedding, it is not necessarily true for the rise of new subordinators (Harris & Campbell 1995:283). In fact, as discussed, Latin already had complementisers which were replaced with new complementisers. The grammaticalisation processes studied here are thus not a case of parataxis > hypotaxis. In following subsections, the grammaticalisation of *che, să, mu* and *cu* will be described in formal terms and compared to the generalisations put forward by typological research.

3.2 Romance languages without a specific irrealis marker

Most Romance varieties feature *que/che* as the only complementiser, independently of the mood of the complement or the complement type. These languages include (but are not limited to) Standard Italian, Catalan, Spanish, French, northern Italian dialects and Portuguese. Some examples are given in (24) and (25):

(24) a. *Giovanni dice* **che** *ieri* *Laura è* *andata* *a Roma.*
          Giovanni say.3SG that yesterday Laura be.3SG gone to Rome
          'Giovanni says that Laura went to Rome yesterday.'

      b. *Giovanni è* *contento* **che** *Laura sia* *andata* *a Roma.*
          Giovanni be.3SG content that Laura be.SBJV.3SG gone to Rome
          'Giovanni is happy that Laura has gone to Rome.'

      c. *Giovanni vuole* **che** *Laura vada* *a Roma.*
          Giovanni want.3SG that Laura go.SBJV.3SG to Rome
          'Giovanni wants Laura to go to Rome.'

                                                                              (It.)

(25) a. *L'Afra* *diu* **que** *l'Àlex* *participa* *en la protesta.*
          the Afra say.3SG that the Alex participate.3SG in the protest
          'Afra says that Alex participates in the protest.'

      b. *L'Afra* *està* *contenta* **que** *l'Àlex* *participi* *en la protesta.*
          the Afra stay.3SG happy that the Alex participate.SBJV.3SG in the protest
          'Afra is happy that Alex participates in the protest.'

      c. *L'Afra* *vol* **que** *l'Àlex* *participi* *en la protesta.*
          the Afra want.3SG that the Alex participate.SBJV.SG in the protest
          'Afra wants Alex to participate in the protest.'

                                                                              (Cat.)

As can be seen in these examples, *che/que* is selected independently of the realis (24a, 25a), factive (24b, 25b) or irrealis (24c, 25c) nature of the complement clause. This *que/che* is a direct continuation of the form appearing in late Latin (see §2.2.3). It thus seems that further grammaticalisation has not taken place since the late Latin stage.

However, it has been argued that *che* introducing realis clauses is located higher than *che* introducing irrealis clauses (Poletto 2000:chap. 5; Poletto 2001). According to this view, we see that this second *che* (henceforth *che*irrealis) moves downwards, or loses its ability to move to Force (where complementisers are located). More generaly, relative QUOD can be assumed to originate

as a lexicalisation of Relwh C⁰, which is even higher (Benincà 2001:48; 2006; Benincà & Poletto 2004), and has thus moved downwards when it became a realis complementiser as well. A similar downward grammaticalisation pattern has been described for many Italo-Romance varieties that present recomplementation patterns, where the second *che* has grammaticalised down from a high Topic position (SceneSett), to a lower Topic head, and finally to Fin (Munaro 2016).

3.3 Infinitival complementisers

Unlike Latin, Romance makes great use of infinitival complementisers, which can be phonologically null (Ø), or surface as AD > *a/à* or DE > *de/di*. There is much lexical variation across Romance languages in the choice of infinitival complementiser, and it is highly idiosyncratic, but some tendencies can be outlined (Vincent 1988:198; Ledgeway 2016b). For instance, irrealis complements tend to be headed by *a/à*:

(26) a. *J'aspire*   **à** *maîtriser   au   moins   une   langue   étrangère.*
      I=aspire.1SG   to master.INF at.the least   one   language   foreign
      'I aspire to master at least one foreign language.'

(Fr.)

   b. *Lorenzo prova   **a** scrivere   un libro.*
      Lorenzo try.3SG   to write.INF a   book
      'Lorenzo tries to write a book.'

(It.)

Realis complements, on the other hand, are typically preceded by a null complementiser, as in Gallo-Romance and Ibero-Romance, or by *di* in Italo-Romance:

(27) a. *Je crois   (**Ø**)   m'être   trompé.*
      I   believe.1SG   REFL.1SG=be.INF   deceived
      'I believe I made a mistake.'

(Fr.)

   b. *So   **di** aver   fatto troppo   poco.*
      know.1SG   of have.INF done   too   little
      'I know I have done too little.'

(It.)

Note, also, that Latin did not typically use controlled infinitives in realis contexts. This is a Romance innovation.

Nevertheless, there are many exceptions to these broad generalisations about the use of AD or DE (e.g. It. *promettere di* 'to promise to', *cercare di* 'to try to', Fr. *essayer de* 'to try to', *s'efforcer de/à* 'try hard to', Sp. *tratar de hacer* vs *intentar Ø hacer* 'to try to do'). We also find oppositions between different control readings depending on the complementiser, as well as a propositional vs irrealis contrast with the same matrix predicate depending on the infinitival complementiser (Ledgeway 2016b:1016). There is thus no strong opposition between realis and irrealis infinitival complementisers in Romance, given the unsystematicity of their selection and the many exceptions.

Other varieties, such as modern (colloquial) Catalan, have generalised one infinitival complementiser *de* 'of':

(28) a. *En Jordi diu   (de)   venir   a Barcelona.*
         the jordi say.3SG   of   come.INF to Barcelona
         'Jordi says he comes to Barcelona.'

 b. *En Jordi intenta (de) promoure   la llengua   catalana a l'estranger.*
         the Jordi try.3SG   of   promote.INF   the language   catalan   at the foreign
         'Jordi tries to promote Catalan abroad.'

 c. *A en Jordi   li sap   greu   (de)   haver-se   perdut la festa.*
         to the Jordi to.him=know.3SG serious of   have.INF=REFL missed the party
         'Jordi regrets having missed the party.'

                                                                                    (Cat.)

De has taken over the traditional selection of *a* or the null infinitival complementiser (Yates 1975:194; Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:395; Ledgeway 2016b:1016).

Traces of infinitival complementisers expressing purpose are found in very late Latin (Adams & Vincent 2016:287–88). As can be seen in the following examples, AD was already being construed with infinitives:

(29) *Quomodo potest   hic   nobis   carnem dare   ad manducare?*
     how   can.3SG this.MASC.NOM us.DAT   meat.ACC give.INF to eat.INF
     'How can this man give us meat to eat?'

                                                          (Lat., Vulgate, *apud* Hopper & Traugott 2003:189)

(30) *Numquid hic   ad furtum venisti   facere... et   si hic   venisti   ad*
     whether   here to theft.ACC come.PRF.2SG do.INF .. and   if here   come.PRF.2SG   to

rapere.

seize.INF

"Whether you came here to steal … and if you came here to seize.'

<div align="right">(Lat., Rand & Hey (1906:264) apud Adams & Vincent 2016:288)</div>

Prepositions grammaticalising into C-elements are cross-linguistically very common (Van Gelderen 2004:30, 101ff; Heine & Kuteva 2007:253), and especially allative prepositions develop frequently into purposive or non-finite complementisers (Haspelmath 1989; Heine & Kuteva 2002:37). Usually the preposition starts out as (part of) the phrase in the specifier of CP, which is then reanalysed as a C-head (Van Gelderen 2004:30ff., 121). AD 'to' was the allative preposition, as well as for the goal/beneficiary, and both are very close to the concept of purpose. Furthermore, AD was already used with the gerund to express purpose; it could have easily been extended to another non-finite verb, viz. the infinitive. DE, on the other hand, has a more general meaning, 'of, concerning' and has arisen as a non-finite parallel to QUOD (Vincent 1988:68). Similar to QUOD, DE realises a functional head which was previously silent and instead marked by roll-up. This movement operation was lost leading to the transition OV > VO.

In some languages, AD has grammaticalised further than in others. In Romanian, it is part of the verbal form of the infinitive, very much like English 'to': *a dormi* 'to sleep', *a mânca* 'to eat'. In others, the use of one of the infinitival complementisers is obligatory in argument positions, e.g. Sardinian. In some languages, such as French or Italian, AD has grammaticalised as an infinitival complementiser but still has a clear purposive meaning in others.

As shown by Rizzi (1997), infinitival complementisers are merged in Fin and follow left-peripheral elements, and with functional verbs, AD and DE can also head smaller complements, as discussed in chapter 2. Therefore, also here, we find that in the case of functional verbs, the complementiser AD comes to occupy a lower position, hence it grammaticalises downwards.

3.4 USID dual complementiser system

As noted above, the general accepted etymologies for *ca* and *che* are respectively QUIA and a merger of QUID/QUOD (Meyer-Lübke 1899; Rohlfs 1969:188–9; Tekavčić 1980). The opposition has traditionally been interpreted as Greek influence in southern Italy (cf. e.g. Rohlfs 1969:190–191). At first glance, it indeed seems that the first stage of this opposition can already be found in late Latin. QUOD and QUIA could both introduce the complements of declarative and epistemic verbs, as seen above (cf. §2.2). On the other hand, UT, introducing irrealis complements, was replaced mostly by QUOD/QUID (leading to *che*), but not by QUIA. QUIA > *ca* thus seems invariably linked to declarative and epistemic complements, whereas QUOD is less restricted as a

complementiser, especially after the loss of the *AcI* as a consequence of the change in the head-directionality parameter (see §2.2.1 for discussion).

The opposition between older stages of USID *che/chi* and *ca*, however, is not identical to the one attested in the ESIDs, Latin or Greek (Ledgeway 2003; 2005; 2016b). In old texts from the Upper South, *che* is used more frequently than *ca*: subjunctive complements are always introduced by *che* whereas the opposition between *ca* and *che* is only found with indicative complements. So, whereas *ca* does indeed mark indicative complements (31), *che* not only introduces subjunctive, but also indicative complements (32):

(31) *Conubbe* **ca** *re Ruberto […] era* *iettato* *per* *la fortuna.*
      know.PRET.3SG that king Robert be.IPFV.3SG thrown for the fortune
      'He knew that King Robert […] was damned by ill-fortune.'

      (OSIDs., AR 64. 26-7 *apud* Ledgeway 2005:348)

(32) *Conoscerao* **che** *llo* *ditto de Salamone* *ène* *vero.*
      know.FUT.3SG that the said of Solomon be.3SG true
      'He will discover the truth of Solomon's words.'

      (OSIDs., AR 4. 16-17 *apud* Ledgeway 2005:348)

Based on an analysis of a corpus of medieval texts, Ledgeway (2003, 2005) finds that there is a tendency to select *che* whenever the left-periphery is activated, independently from the mood of the complement clause; *ca* is only found with indicative complements in which the left periphery is not activated. The alternation between *che* and *ca* is thus only found with indicative complements and does not relate to mood/modality as in modern USIDs. Given the fact that *che* can precede left-peripheral items, it can be taken to be in Force; *ca*, on the other hand, is located in Fin. This is confirmed by the following examples, in which both complementisers are realised:

(33) a. *Et èy* *manifesta cosa che homo* *che* *se ave* *a defendere* *a la*
          and be.3SG clear thing that man that REFL=have.3SG to defend.INF to the
          patria *soa* *intre* *li amici* *e* *li canussienti* *suoy* *cha*
          motherland his between the friends and the acquaintances his that
          ave *a* *chesta* *parte gran prerogativa* *e* *gran avantayo.*
          have.3SG to this part big prerogative and big advantage
          'And it is clear that the man who has to defend his motherland between his friends and acquaintances that from this part he has a great prerogative and big advantage.'

          (ONap., LDT 126.2-4, *apud* Ledgeway 2003:121)

     b. *Et* *ancora li mandao* *a dire* *lo re* *che si* *li* *volia*

and   still   them=send.PRET.3SG to say.INF the king that REFL=them=want.IPFV.3SG

obedire alli   sua comandamenti,   ca   li perdonara   omne cosa

obey.INF to.the his commands   that   them forgive.COND.3SG   every thing

'And stilll the king sent him to say that he wanted to obey to his orders, and that he

forgave him for everything.'

(OSal., Sidrac 2v.38-9 *apud* Ledgeway 2003:121)

These recomplementation examples confirm that *cha/ca* occurs in Fin, following all left-peripheral elements, and that *che* is realised in a higher position (Force).

This is in contrast with what we find in the modern-day dialects which have generalised one complementiser: the realis complementiser is located in Force, whereas the irrealis complementiser is in the lower C-position:

(34) a. *Vulissa   chi (*'u canciellu) 'u cunzassaru   ('u canciellu)*
          want.COND.1SG that the fence   it=repair.SBJV.3PL the fence
          'I wish they would repair the fence.'

   b. *Vulìa   chi (*NA BELLA SAGNA) priperassa   NA BELLA SAGNA*
          want.IPFV.1SG   that a nice lasagna   prepare.SBJV.IPFV.3SG a nice lasagna
          (*nun   nu   purpettune).*
          NEG   the   meatloaf
          'I wish (s)he would prepare a nice lasagne, not a meatloaf.'

(USIDs, archaising Cos., Ledgeway 2012c:174)

The impossibility of having a focus or topic following the irrealis complementiser *chi* is taken as evidence that *chi* is in a low position; it has changed position since the older Italo-Romance varieties and moved downwards.

As discussed in chapter 2, this situation is not attested in all USIDs. In Verbicarese, the irrealis complementisers preferably precede the left-peripheral elements and are thus located in ForceP:

(35) a. *Mə cumbwinge   (?sta materia) che   sta materia âja   studijà   bona.*
          REFL=convince.1SG   this subject   that   this subject it=have.to.1SG study.INF well
          'I decide that this subject, we have to study it very well.'

   b. *M'ajə   cumbwinda cchə U VRƏVƏCARISƏ   ama   parlà   no   u talianə.*
          REFL=have.1SG convinced   that the Verbicarese must.1PL speak.INF   NEG   the Italian
          'I decide that we speak Verbicarese, not Italian.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Verbicaro (CS))</div>

Comparing these two modern patterns with old Italo-Romance, we see that *che* has lowered in the first type of USIDs, but not in Verbicarese (or has risen again due to contact with Standard Italian). *Ca,* on the other hand, is now always located in *Force* and has thus 'moved up' in the tree. The opposition found in modern USIDs therefore cannot be a direct continuation of the late Latin tendencies (Ledgeway 2003).

That the modern-day USID opposition is not a direct continuation of Latin QUIA vs QUOD is also confirmed by the diachrony of the Abruzzese complementation system. There has always been a split between factive and irrealis complementation, but this has not always been expressed formally in the same way (D'Alessandro & Di Felice 2015). Whereas the oldest texts (until the 16th century) present a distinction between an infinitival complementation pattern very similar to the Latin *AcI* and subjunctive/*che*, *ca* is almost absent from subordinate clauses, at least in literary texts. The *ca* vs *che* distinction is found in written sources only from the 17th-18th century onwards. The disappearance of the *AcI*-like pattern might have reinforced the use of *ca*, probably used in spoken but not in written language, for factive complements. In Modern Abruzzese, *ca* has become the default complementiser and *che/chi* is only used in unselected irrealis subordinates. This generalisation of one of the two complements has occurred in many central and southern Italian dialects nowadays (Rohlfs 1983:147–54; Ledgeway 2012c; Ledgeway 2016b; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014; Colasanti 2018a). In a minority, it is the irrealis complementiser *che* which has been generalised (at the expense of *ca*):

(36) a. *Penze*   **ca**   *Marje*   *ve'*   *sicuramende.*
      think.1SG   that   Maria   come.3SG   certainly
      'I think that Maria will come for sure.'

    b. *Vuje*   **ca**   *ve'.*
      want.1SG that   come.3SG
      'I want that s/he comes.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Arielli (CH), D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010:2041–42)</div>

(37) a. [m annu   'rittu **ke** ttu 'vieni   ri'mani]
      to.me=have.3PL said that you come.2SG   tomorrow
      'They told me you come tomorrow.'

    b. [ɛ   m'mɛʎʎo **ke** v'vie   ri'mani]
      be.3SG   better   that come.2SG   tomorrow
      'It is better if you come tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Marzano Appio (CE), Manzini & Savoia 2005:410)</div>

In the transition from late Latin to Romance, there has not been any grammaticalisation in the sense that a lexical item has become grammatical; both *che* and *ca* derive from complementisers that were already used in Latin. Nonetheless, there has been a further development, inasmuch these complementisers have changed position, as shown in the following table:

Table 3.2 Positions of QUOD and QUIA in 4 types of USIDs

		(late) Latin	**Old variety**	**Modern variety**
Verbicaro	QUIA > *ca*	Force	Fin	Force
	QUID/QUOD > *che*	Force	Fin to Force	Force
Cos. arch.	QUIA > *ca*	Force	Fin	Force
	QUID/QUOD > *che*	Force	Fin to Force	Fin
Arielli	QUIA > *ca*	Force	Fin	Force (IND), Fin (SBJV)
	QUID/QUOD > *che*	Force	Fin to Force	--
Marzano	QUIA > *ca*	Force	Fin	--
Appio	QUID/QUOD > *che*	Force	Fin to Force	Force (IND), Fin (SBJV)

QUOD and QUIA are already C-elements in Latin, where they originally act as complementisers and relative pronouns. Here, it is assumed that they are in Force,[3] and from there they grammaticalise downwards to Fin. From there, the different types of USIDs underwent different changes. In a variety like Verbicarese both *ca* and *che* have the possibility to move up again to Force from Fin where they check/value a modal feature (cf. Ledgeway 2005ssq). In archaising Cosentino and similar varieties, *che* loses its ability to move to Force, and instead *ca* is directly merged in Force.

Furthermore, if we also take the Latin development into account, there has been a reanalysis of relative pronouns into complementisers. Since relative pronouns occupy a high position within the CP (Benincà 2001:48), this grammaticalisation has caused a downwards movement. Furthermore, the modality-specific features of these elements have changed: QUOD is originally a [factive] complementiser but gradually becomes more unmarked; in most SIDs, it can head both realis and irrealis complements. *Quia* maintains its feature of [realis]. [factive] is not marked in an

---

[3] This is based on Benincà's work (Benincà 2001:48; 2006; Benincà & Poletto 2004), where she argues that relative pronouns are merged high in the C-domain, higher than complementiser *che*. QUOD had both functions. There is however no conclusive evidence for the exact position within the C-domain of QUOD, QUIA in Classical Latin. Danckaert (2012:107) tentatively suggests that UT, CUM and SI are in Fin, but does not give an exact position for other complementisers. Also Salvi (2005) locates UT in Fin. Ledgeway (2017:191–194) shows that in the *Itinerarium Egeriae,* QUOD, UT and other complementisers can precede verbs in second position targeting Fin; hence, the complementisers are located in Force in late Latin.

independent way in most varieties (but see Colasanti 2018b for data from southern Lazio dialects which do mark factivity in the C-domain).

Taking into account the generalisations made by Heine and Narrog (2017:10) we could say that the development from QUOD/QUID to *che* and QUIA to *ca* is not a case of grammaticalisation proper; the complementisers already derive from C-elements. It is thus not in line with generalisation (23a). They do lose their original function as relative clause markers, and become first factive complementisers, after which *quod* generally becomes an unmarked complementiser. This is thus not a case of desemanticisation but rather a case of syntactic generalisation (*quod*) or change (*quia*). There is ambiguity in the initial stage of *quod* as a proleptic pronoun (cf. §2.1.2). Morphosyntactically, *quod* and *quia* lose their ability to inflect for gender and number and fossilise as neuter forms. At the same time, they 'gain' the marking for mood/modality.

3.4.1 *Ko* as third complementiser?

In the discussion in section 2.2 above, I have claimed *que/che* derives from a relative element that had the form *[ke(d)]. Some of the first Italo-Romance texts from the 10th century still present a separate form *ko* < QUOD, which later merged with the variant *che* (Herman 1963:163; Rohlfs 1969:188). Indeed, in one of the earliest written texts in Italo-Romance, the *Placito Capuano* from 960, we find *ko*:

(38) *Sao* **ko** *kelle terre, per* *kelle fini* *que* *ki* *contene,*
know.1SG that those lands for those confines which here contain.3SG
trenta anni le possette *parte sancti* *Benedicti*
thirty years them=possess.PRET.3SG party of.saint Benedict
'I know that, those lands, with those borders which are contained here [in the map], have belonged for thirty years to the part [= monastery] of St. Benedict [of Montecassino]'

(OIt., Ledgeway 2006:116)

This third complementiser has left traces in a dialect in northern Campania, the dialect of Gallo Matese in the province of Caserta, in the form of *cu* (Rohlfs 1969:188; Manzini & Savoia 2005:466):

(39) *Vogliə* *cu* *bbivə.*
want.1SG that drink.2SG
'I want you to drink.'

(USIDs, Gallo (CE), Rohlfs 1969:188)

Furthermore, Old Sardinian presents a complementiser *ko,* which is most frequently used as a temporal conjunction (Meyer-Lübke 1902:72–73; Herman 1963:155; De Dardel 1983:65–66):

(40) *Ki   fuit   natu pus **co**   parthiramus.*
     which be.PRF.3SG said after that leave.PST.1PL
     'Which was said after we left.'

(OSrd., *Cond. SPS* p. 284, via Atlisor)

This form however derives from *QUOMODO* and not *CUM* or QUOD/QUID, because of the vowel /o/ rather than /u/, which would have given /ku/ (Meyer-Lübke 1902:73). QUOD/QUID on the other hand has led to Sardinian *chi*. As discussed in §2.2 above, *QUOMODO* could introduce complements to epistemic and declarative verbs. Other varieties that present a complementiser *co* are Provençal and some Raeto-Romance varieties (Herman 1963: 166). *Co* is a shorter form of *com* in Old Provençal, which is used especially with factive verbs such as verbs of feeling. As we have seen for late Latin, its interrogative character is still noticeable (ibidem).

In conclusion, the merger between *QUOD* and *QUID* leading to *[ke(d)] did not take place everywhere, as there are some (old) Romance varieties which present outcomes of both *QUID* and *QUOD*. Not all forms [ko] or [ku] derive from *QUOD*, however; Sardinian *ko* on the other hand derives from *QUOMODO*. Similarly, *QUOMODO* develops into temporal complementisers in other Romance varieties.

3.5 ESID *cu* and *mu*

The commonly accepted view is that the complementiser *cu* derives from the Latin complementiser *QUOD* (Rohlfs 1969:191; Loporcaro 1997a:347; Mancarella 1998). Its distribution across the Salentino dialects seems to be linked to Byzantine domination. Greek influence would have stimulated the development of *quod* as the irrealis complementisers, which had already autonomously developed from Latin (Mancarella 1998:289; Ledgeway 2006). Byzantine influence has probably not caused but only favoured the development of a distinction between clauses with a final or irrealis value on the one hand and clauses with an assertive or declarative value on the other (Mancarella 1998: 288).

For Calabrian *mu*, there seems to be a general agreement to see it as a result of the grammaticalisation of the Latin adverb *MŎDO* 'now, presently' (Sorrento 1951; Rohlfs 1969:192; Ledgeway 1998:20; Roberts & Roussou 2003:88; De Angelis 2013; De Angelis 2015; 2016; Squillaci 2016:170–3). The change from adverb into complementiser is accompanied by

phonological erosion, leading to apocope and raising of the unstressed vowel to [u] (Sorrento 1951:394). The discussion in the literature mostly concerns whether this adverb alone stood at the basis of *mu,* or in combination with the subjunctive, possibly in combination with the Latin complementiser *ut* (Roberts & Roussou 2003:88; Squillaci 2016:170–3; De Angelis 2016).

A totally different approach is suggested by Bertoni (1905; 1916 *apud* De Angelis 2016:77n.8), adopted by Ledgeway (2016d:269), according to which both *cu* and *mu* derive from QUOMODO 'how'. QUOMODO is also suggested as an etymon for *mu* (but not *cu*) by Meyer-Lübke (1899:516) and Scerbo (*apud* Sorrento 1951:386). According to this alternative hypothesis, Calabrian *mu* results from QUOMODO by eliding QUO- and Salentino *cu* by eliding -MODO. *Quomodo* was originally a compound from the interrogative *quis* 'which' and the noun *modus* 'way, mode'*,* both in the ablative case, meaning 'in which way'. We can assume that this compound must have been transparent, as both *quis* and *modus* remain frequent throughout the history of Latin and the meaning of the compound is compositional. Historically, in Latin, there must have been both *quomodo* 'how' and *quo modo* 'in which way'. Indeed, *quomodo* could appear in *tmesis* (cf. Lewis Short Oxford Latin Dictionary 'quomodo'):

(41) *Quo   tu   me   modo   voles   esse.*
    which.ABL you.NOM me.ACC   way.ABL want.SBJV.2SG be.INF
    'As you want me to be.'

<div align="right">(Lat., Plaut. Cist. 1,1,48)</div>

The stress of *quōmŏdŏ* was *quómodo* rather than *quomódo*. This is unproblematic for deriving *cu*, which supposedly derives from **quo* after *–modo* has been dropped. Assuming that *mu* derives from the second, unstressed syllable, is not problematic either. Given the transparent nature of this compound, of which *modo* is the head, we can assume *modo* still bears some stress. Furthermore, when appearing in tmesis as in the example above, *modo* must have borne stress. The unstressed part of *–do* would be lost, but the first part [mo] must have borne some (secondary) stress, leading to the SCal. *mu*.

I will therefore argue that *mu* is the result of *–MODO,* after the loss of initial QUO-, and *cu* is from the initial syllable QUO after the loss of -MODO. In this section, this idea will be further explored as it has received very little attention in the existing literature. The hypothesis of QUOMODO will be compared to the traditionally accepted views on the basis of Latin evidence, the cross-linguistic evidence from frequent grammaticalisation paths and their ability to account for the phonological and syntactic properties of both *mu* and *cu.* I will conclude that QUOMODO is a more probable etymon than either QUOD or MODO (UT).

3.5.1   Evidence from Latin

A first test for the validity of the various proposed etymologies is given by the use of these etyma in Latin, i.e. the contexts in which MODO, QUOD or QUOMODO would have grammaticalised into *cu* and *mu*. Is there any evidence for the use of these etyma in the right contexts, which could have led to their grammaticalisation as final and irrealis complementisers?

With regard to Latin QUOD as the proposed etymon for Salentino *cu,* the evidence seems strong, as it did indeed replace *ut* in irrealis complements and final clauses, as discussed in §2.2. *Quod* (and later *que*) was used as a general subordinator, including for irrealis clauses. *Quod* therefore appears in similar contexts to *cu*: introducing both final and irrealis complement clauses in general. The only assumption that is necessary is that the merger between QUOD and QUID yielding *que* has not taken place as in other Romance languages, as the final vowel of *cu* cannot derive from the final [e] of *que*.

The contexts in which MODO supposedly grammaticalised however are less clear. As noted above, two main hypotheses have been put forth to explain the grammaticalisation of the Latin adverb MŎDO 'now'*,* which survives in many central and southern Italian varieties as the adverb *mo'* 'now'. According to Rohlfs (1969:192) MŎDO has been used in a paratactic construction with a verb, such as the hypothetical example in (42) leading to the complementiser *mu*:

(42)   *Volo   et   modo venio.*
    want.1SG   and   now   come.1SG
    'I want and now I come' > 'I want to come.'

<div align="right">(Lat., Ledgeway 1998:48)</div>

However, there is little to no written evidence for these paratactic structures (De Angelis 2015:8; 2016:84). Second, assuming that this paratactic construction is the origin of *mu* does not explain why the complementation pattern should be limited to irrealis contexts; this use of *modo* could just as easily have been used for any kind of verbal complement. Third, there appears to be no cross-linguistic evidence for adverbs like 'now' developing into (irrealis) complementisers (see §3.5.2). Finally, a question that emerges is why the coordination *et* 'and' has not left any trace; the vowel would have been preserved under normal developments, and the [t] would have triggered *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* of the initial *m-,* contrary to fact in that *mu/ma/mi* never shows RF.

The second hypothesis is that the adverb MODO could be used to reinforce the subjunctive and the imperative (Sorrento 1951). In these contexts, the adverb *modo* had a modal rather than a temporal meaning, although it typically occurred postverbally, which is problematic (De Angelis

2016:83). However, it would be specifically the combination of *modo* with the irrealis complementiser *ut* that would have grammaticalised into the Calabrian and Sicilian subordinating particle *mu/mi/ma* (Sorrento 1951; Roberts & Roussou 2003; Squillaci 2016). The combination of *modo* with the subjunctive complementiser *ut* can be used in Latin to express a counterfactual value, as in the following example:

(43) a. *Modo   ut   tacere   possis.*
          modo   that   be-silent.INF   can.SBJV.2SG
          'If only you could be silent'

(Lat., Ter., *Phorm.* 59 *apud* Roberts & Roussou 2003:94)

      b. *Modo ut   sciam.*
          modo that   know.SBJV.1SG
          'if only I knew.'

(Lat., Pl. *apud* Roberts & Roussou 2003:94)

Since this use of MODO has the clearest modal interpretation, it is argued that the adverb *modo* was reanalysed as lexicalising the head M(ood) instead of Adv and grammaticalised as a mood marker, which led to phonological reduction and semantic bleaching. The semantics have bleached as *mu*'s present function seems to be as a marker of irrealis mood, in contrast with Latin *modo,* which had a wide range of meanings, from the counterfactual value, adverbial use and discourse particle (Roberts & Roussou 2003:94).

       This account is highly problematic for a number of reasons. First, we have seen in §2.2 that *ut* was lost in late Latin and has not survived in any Romance varieties; instead, it has been widely replaced by *quod,* and to a lesser degree, *quoniam* and *quomodo*. Roberts & Roussou (2003: 97, fn 8) argue that, on a par with Salentino *cu*, *mu* is a development that happened between the 5th and the 11th centuries, but there are no data to confirm this hypothesis (see also (Calabrese 1993:73–6). Both Salentino and Calabrian share the other innovations in the Romance complementation system, such as loss of the *AcI*, loss of supines and *ut/ne* (Calabrese 1993:73–6; Roberts & Roussou 2003:97n.8). *Ut/ne* has thus already been lost by the time that *mu* and *cu* grammaticalise as subordinating subjunctive particles. It therefore seems impossible that *mu* derives from *modo + ut*.

       Second, even if the counterfactual or modal character derives from the combination of *modo ut,* from which *ut* has been lost, there is no evidence for the survival of the subjunctive in these Calabrian varieties which could have distinguished counterfactual *modo* from temporal *modo*. The present subjunctive paradigm is lost in most southern Italian dialects, including southern Calabrian varieties (Rohlfs 1968:301; Ledgeway 2016d). Furthermore, the counterfactual

hypothetical use might explain *mu* in optative clauses, but is more difficult to imagine as a final complementiser.

Third, in the Calabrian varieties, this counterfactual value is not expressed by *mu* (Chillà & Citraro 2012:118). In the dialect of Squillace, the examples given by Roberts and Roussou (2003:94) are translated differently. The same is found in Bovese:

(44) a. *Si sulu u sapia.*

   if only it=know.IPFV.1SG

   'If only I had known'

   b. *Si sulu   ti porrissi   stara   quetu.*

   if   only   you.REFL=can.COND.2SG   stay.INF   quiet

   'If you could only be quiet'

   (SCal., Squillace (RC), Chillà & Citraro 2012:118)

(45) a. *S'u sapiva.*

   if=it I.knew

   'If only I knew.'

   b. *U/so   ll'era   saputu.*

   if=it/If=it   it=be.IPFV.1SG   known

   'If only I had known'

   c. *Si potiva   mi   si staci   zzittu.*

   if   can.IPFV.3SG MU   REFL=stay.3SG   silent

   'If only he could be quiet.'

   (SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

This is unexpected if *mu* is the result of the grammaticalisation of *modo* in these counterfactual hypothetical clauses.

In contrast, as seen in §2.2, there is evidence of QUOMODO being used in the right type of contexts. It is used in later stages of Latin as a complementiser, especially in contexts where it replaces the *AcI*, so with *verba dicendi* and *sciendi.* Also, *quomodo* replaces *ut* in various contexts in late Latin (see section 2.2). Specifically, *quomodo* could appear as a final complementiser:

(46) *Columbaria   singula   esse   oportet,   ut os   habeat*

   nest.NOM   singular.NOM   be.INF be.necessary.3SG so mouth.ACC have.SBJV.3SG

   (Columba),   quo modo   inoire   et   exire   possit

   dove.NOM   how   enter.INF and   exit.INF   can.SBJV.3SG

'Every nest needs to be [like this], so that it has a mouth for (the dove) to be able to enter and exit.'

(Lat., Varro *Rust.* 3, 7,4 *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

(47) *Nocte   incendi   ignem   iussit,   non   quod in die   non*
night.ABL light.INF.PASS fire.ACC order.PRF.3SG NEG that in day.ABL NEG

incederetur,   sed   quomodo   secundo   fieret   diebus   singulis
go.in.PASS.3SG but how twice become.SBJV.IPFV.3SG days.ABL singular.ABL

holocaustum.
offering.ACC

'At night he has ordered that the fire was lit, not in order to not start during the day, but so that the offering would happen twice every day.'

(Lat., Hesych. *In lev.* 6, 8/12 p. 846ᴮ *apud* Hofmann & Szantyr 1972:650)

It is this combination of appearing both in final adjuncts and as the complementiser for irrealis complements that mirrors the Greek *(hi)na* 'in order to'. The same parallel is not found with the counterfactual conditional use of *modo (ut)*.

3.5.2   'How' as complementiser

Wh-elements such as 'how' are not among the elements that cross-linguistically most frequently develop into complementisers, such as verbs of saying, conjunctions, pronouns, adpositions or case markers (Heine & Kuteva 2002; Noonan 2007:57). However, the development of a *wh*-element into a complementiser is not unprecedented (Harris & Campbell 1995:298; Heine & Kuteva 2007:243; Willis 2007). The Georgian complementiser *raytamca* 'that' derives from an interrogative wh-phrase *ray*, and English 'how' as well as Italian *come* 'how' can be used as a complementiser (Legate 2010; Van Gelderen 2015), as for instance in the following examples:

(48)   a.   Bob Cratchit told them how he had a situation in his eye for Master Peter.

(Charles Dickens, *Christmas Carol* iii, 1844, OED *apud* Willis 2007:434)

        b.   Dwyer told the players how he wanted to win the two-match series against Scotland and how he not only wanted to reclaim the Bledisloe Cup from the All Blacks but complete Australia's first ever 3-0 series whitewash.

(British National Corpus, CB2 1468, *apud* Willis 2007:434)

(49) *Ha   evidenziato   come avessi   ragione.*
have.3SG shown how have.SBJV.IPFV.1SG reason

'S/he has shown how/that I was right.'

(It.)

Most importantly, the history of Latin presents a parallel development: *ut.* Originally, *ut* was an interrogative pronoun, meaning 'how', but as shown in §2.1, it is one of the main complementisers of Classical Latin. If this change from 'how' to irrealis complementiser has already taken place in the history of Latin, being cross-linguistically rare is not necessarily an argument against the hypothesis that *cu* and *mu* derive from QUOMODO. *Quomodo* is synonymous with *ut* as an interrogative element, so it is a logical replacement for *ut* as an irrealis complementiser as soon as *ut* starts disappearing from Latin.

As seen above in §2.2.1-2.2.2, QUOMODO has been employed as a complementiser, both for realis and irrealis contexts. QUOMODO is thus used in the right contexts in Latin. Furthermore, in other Romance languages, such as Old Romanian (50)-(51), Old Spanish (52)-(53) and Old Italian (54), outcomes of QUOMODO can be employed as a final complementiser as well, exactly like *cu* and *mu*:

(50) *Voao   lăsâ   obrazu,   cumu se slediţi   urmeloru   lui.*
to.you.PL let.PST.3SG example,   how SĂ follow.2PL traces   of.him
'He left you his example, so that you can follow his traces.''

(ORo., Cod. Vor. 149, 13, *apud* Meyer-Lübke 1899:641)

(51) *Adunaţi-va   într'una cum să spui   voao   acei ce   va   veni.*
unite=REFL.2PL   in one   how SA to.tell   to.you   these that AUX.FUT.3SG come.INF
'Come together, so that I tell you, what will happen.'

(ORo., Gaster 1, 35, 17, *apud* Meyer-Lübke 1899:641)

(52) *El   le daría   lugar y tiempo   como á sus   solas   pudiese*
he   to.him=give.COND.3SG   place and time   how   on his.PL own.PL   could.SBJV.3SG
hablar   á Camila.
talk   to Camila
'He would give him time and place so that he could talk on his own with Camila.'

(OSp., D. Quij. 1,33, *apud* Meyer-Lübke 1899:641)

(53) *Armas   levaba   rreales El   su cuerpo   bien   guarnido   Con   palomas las*
weapons carry.IPFV.3SG royal he   his body   well   equipped   with   doves   the
sennales, Commo   fuese   conoscido.

signals,   how   be.SBJV.PST.3SG recognised

'He carried royal weapons, his body well equipped with doves as signals, so that we would be recognised.'

<div align="right">(OSp., A.O. 1755 apud Meyer-Lübke 1899:641)</div>

(54)   *Io m'aggio*   *posto in core*   *a Dio*   *servire,*   *com'io potesse*   *gire*

        I to.me=have.1SG   put   in heart to God   serve.INF,   how I can.SBJV.IPFV.1SG go.INF

        in paradiso.

        to paradise

        'I resolved to serve God, so that I could go to paradise.'

<div align="right">(OIt., Giacomo di Lentini, apud Rohlfs 1969:181)</div>

Furthermore, traces of *quomodo* as a complementiser are attested in other Romance varieties as seen above (§3.4.1). Adverbs developing into complementisers are cross-linguistically quite rare. A *wh*-element such as 'how' is not a frequent source for a (final) complementiser either, but it is not unprecedented, especially in Latin and in other Romance languages.

Quomodo survives in almost all Romance varieties as the interrogative and relative pronoun 'how'. This is also the case for Salentino *comu* and Calabrian *cumu/comu* (Rohlfs 1969:280–81). The fact that one etymon leads to two different functional words is not however necessarily problematic. We will see the same in the case of Romanian *să*, which coexisted with conditional *să* until the 17th century. Similarly, in Old Sardinian, QUOMODO led to both the complementiser *ko* and the interrogative *comente* (< QUO(MODO) + -MENTE).

In sum, the development of 'how' into a complementiser is cross-linguistically quite common. Most importantly, a similar development has happened both in Latin, where *ut* 'how' changed into a irrealis complementiser, and in other Romance varieties, where outcomes of QUOMODO can head final clauses. The cross-linguistic evidence thus supports the view that *cu/mu* derive from QUOMODO.

3.5.3   Similarities in Calabrian and Salentino

As discussed in chapter 2, the two subordinating particles *cu* and *mu* have a very similar distribution (except for the relative order to negation and the possibility of combining with *wh*-elements). They are selected by similar verbs, only allow present tense verbs in their complements[4] and show VOS as their unmarked word order; the preverbal subject position is

---

[4] Salentino does allow perfective forms; some Calabrian varieties close to the isogloss which delimites the use of *mu* instead of non-finite forms, allow imperfective past forms as well, cf. chap. 2, note 11.

pragmatically marked. A unified analysis of the origin of these two very similar particles is to be preferred above a different hypothesis for *cu* and *mu*, as the similarities between the two would be automatically accounted for. The same element, *quomodo*, which can be used as a complementiser with realis and irrealis verbs, and as a final conjunction, is employed in both varieties to mirror the Grec(anic)o *na*.

Assuming two different etyma for Salentino *cu* and Calabrian *mu* would lead us to assume that the similarities between the two varieties are entirely due to Greek influence. Also, it would lead us to presuppose two quite different varieties of Latin where the irrealis was marked in two completely different ways. We would have to assume that *modo ut* not only had been preserved, but also generalised to irrealis contexts in Calabria but not in Puglia or in other parts of (southern) Italy. This is unexpected given the relative homogeneity of the rest of the southern Italian varieties with regard to the etyma for complementisers.

A problematic aspect that differentiates Salentino and Calabrian varieties is word order with respect to negation and the (im)possibility of appearing with other *wh*-elements. As seen in chapter 2, there are some structural differences between Salentino *cu* and Calabrian *mu*: *cu* never co-occurs with other complementisers or *wh*-words and precedes negation, whereas *mu/mi/ma* does combine with C-elements and follows negation. This has often been explained by arguing that *cu* occupies a higher position than *mu/ma/mi* (Damonte 2011), which is not expected under a unified approach to the development of both particles. I suggest that *nommi/nommu* is the negative counterpart of *mu/mi/ma* (see for discussion chapter 2, §3.1).

3.5.4 *Raddoppiamento fonosintattico*: problems and possible solutions

Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico is the phenomenon whereby certain (grammatical) words trigger the lengthening of the initial consonant of a following word (Fanciullo 1986; Nespor & Vogel 1986; Chierchia 1982; Repetti 1991; Loporcaro 1997b). The view that *mu, ma, mi* derives from *MODO UT* predicts that these subordinators cause phonological doubling of the initial consonant of a following word, contrary to fact:[5]

---

[5] In some varieties, such as the variety of Crotone, some varieties of the Cosentino-Crotonese area and in the variety of Bovalino, *u/i* triggers RF (Chillà & Citraro 2012:118–9):

(i)   *vogliu   i mmangiu* (SCal., Bovalino)
       want.1SG   MU eat.1SG
       'I want to eat.'
(ii)   *dicci   u' bbena* (SCal., Crotone)
       tell.IMP=him   MU come.3SG
       'Say that he should come.'
(iii) *Ricil   u'nni vena trova*   (SCal., Rossano)
       tell.IMP=him MU=us come.3SG find

(55) [suɲɲu   kunˈtiɛntu   pɛ mmu viɛni]

be.1SG   happy   for MU   come.2SG

'I am happy that you come.'

<div align="right">(SCal., San Pietro a Maida (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005: 656)</div>

Grammatical words ending in –T in Latin normally trigger RF: cf., for example, modern SID outcomes of ET. This absence of *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* is however correctly predicted by the hypothesis of QUOMODO as the etymon for *mu*.

However, the fact that *cu* triggers RF in Salentino is *not* predicted, as *quo(modo)* does not end in a consonant that could have caused the attested doubling. An example of RF with *cu* is given in (56):

(56) *Oyyu   la Maria   ku bbae   ddai   mprima.*

want.1SG   the Maria   CU come.3SG   there before

'I want Maria to go there before.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992: 278)</div>

The fact that *cu* triggers doubling would be explained under the hypothesis *cu < QUOD*. As a solution to this problem, I assume that RF has been extended by analogy with other complementisers, such as *che < QUID*, which trigger RF. In fact, there are other cases of RF without a deleted etymological final consonant in southern Italian dialects which are explicable as analogical extensions (Loporcaro 1997a: 48). Also *ca* triggers RF in some texts, even if there is no etymological final consonant:

(57) *Ca   tte   bollo   multu   addemandare.*

that to.you   want.1SG   much   ask.INF

'that/because I want to ask you many things.'

<div align="right">(OSIDs, *Ritmo cassinese*, Loporcaro 1997:105)</div>

Another possible analogy that might have led to *cu* acquiring [+RF] is because the *quo–* [kwo] resulting from the elision of –*MODO* is homophonous with the outcome of QUOD (viz. *k(w)o) found widely elsewhere in surrounding dialects. Note also that (some instances of) Tuscan-Italian *come*

_____

'Say that he should come to visit us.'

However, these are not all counterexamples as the particle *u* in Crotone arguably has a different etymon from *mu*, namely *unde* (Rohlfs 1969:193–194).

< QUOMODO (+ET) trigger RF (Rohlfs 1966:235). If the latter is [+RF], this could easily have been extended to *cu* < QUOMODO, which is almost homophonous with the complementiser *k(w)o. The RF triggered by *cu* is therefore not a problem under the analysis of *cu* < QUO(MODO).

3.5.5 Early Salentino

Unlike Modern Salentino, the early Salentino of the 15th century prose text *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* is characterised by a triple complementiser system, comprising *cu, che* and *ca*, argued to derive from QUOD, QUID and QUIA respectively (Sgrilli 1984; Ledgeway 2005). As in most modern Salentino varieties, *ca* and *cu* introduce indicative (58) and subjunctive clauses (58), respectively. In Old Salentino, *che* instead can be used with both indicative (59) and subjunctive clauses (59):

(58) a. *Significano ca illo   fece   dissobediencia.*
          mean.3PL   that he   make.PRET.3SG disobedience
          'They mean that he was disobedient.'
                    (OSal., *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* 6v.36-7, *apud* Ledgeway 2005: 367)

      b. *Commandao   cu doy   fossero   uno.*
          command.PRET.3SG   CU two   be.SBJV.IPFV.3PL one.
          'He commanded that two should be one.'
                    (OSal., *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* 24v.19, *apud* Ledgeway 2005:367)

(59) a. *Significa   che   lo fiholo de deo serà   baptizato   in l'acqua.*
          mean.3SG   that   the son   of God be.FUT.3SG baptised   in the-water
          'It means that the son of God will be baptised in the water.'
                    (OSal., *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* 4r.12, *apud* Ledgeway 2005:367)

      b. *Comandao   che   Sidrac   foxe   priso.*
          command.PRET.3SG   that Sidrac   be.SBJV.IPFV.3SG apprehended.
          'He commanded that Sidrac was apprehended.'
                    (OSal., *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* 2v.18, *apud* Ledgeway 2005:367)

This three-way distinction is sensitive to both mood and the activation of the left periphery of the clause (Ledgeway 2005:367ff.). More precisely, when the left periphery is not activated, *cu* introduces irrealis complements whereas *ca* introduces realis clauses. However, when the topic-focus fields are activated, the complementiser moves to Force, which is located higher, to precede topics and foci, and both complementisers are invariably spelled out as *che*. This latter complementiser however was subsequently lost in most varieties, although some varieties, such

as Leccese, show traces of an irrealis complementiser *ci*, which surfaces in volitive main clauses (Rohlfs 1969:189; De Angelis 2015:5).

Under the traditional view which derives *cu* from QUOD, it is necessary to assume that the merger between QUID and QUOD did not take place as it did in other Romance varieties (cf. Gallo Matese (CE), §3.4.1) in those cases where there was no overlap between QUOD and QUID. At a subsequent stage *che* is lost, whereas both *ca* and *cu* continue, but only *ca* can lexicalise Force like OSal. *che*. The unified analysis instead offers us a simpler scenario. If *cu* derives from QUOMODO, there is no problem in assuming that *che* has the same etymology as in other Romance varieties. The use of *cu* has remained unchanged, as it can introduce subjunctive, irrealis complements. On the other hand, the distinction *ca* vs *che* has been lost, as in many other southern Italo-Romance varieties (Ledgeway 2009b:7; 2016d:269), where one of the two complementisers has been generalised. This has been *ca* in Salentino, whereas *che* has disappeared. The complementiser *cu*, on the other hand, has survived as it was also heading reduced complements to functional verbs, something that *ca* cannot do. The situation found in Old Salentino is thus more easily accounted for under the unified view than the traditional analysis of *cu* < QUOD.

3.5.6 Allomorphic variants of *mu*

Problematic for any hypothesis is the presence of the allomorphic variation of the particle *mu.* Within Calabria, apart from *mu*, we find *ma* in Catanzaro and its immediate surroundings and *mi* in most parts of the province of Reggio Calabria, as well as reduced forms *'u* and *'i* (Sorrento 1951; Rohlfs 1969). *Mi* and *ma* are only phonetic variants of the same particle; there are no dialects reported in the literature where the various forms of *mu* coexist (Damonte 2009: 104). *Mu* is considered to be the oldest form (Rohlfs 1969: 192), as it would be the regular outcome of *(QUO)MODO*. The other variants possibly arose under influence of the unmarked complementisers: *mi* is argued to have developed by influence of *chi* < *[ked], whereas *ma* has been influenced by the complementiser *ca* < QUIA. Another hypothesis has related the [a] in *ma* to a phonological rule changing unstressed final [e] to [a] (Rohlfs 1969:192n.2), in the same way that final [e] becomes [i] in the Reggino area. If this is correct, all variants would be explained by regular phonological developments.

This problem has led to a very different analysis, proposed by Damonte (2009; 2011:236), who analyses *mu* as a non-argumental clitic cluster consisting of *m* (a 1st person dative clitic) and *u* (a direct object clitic)*. The main argument for this analysis is that in some varieties the form of the particle depends on the presence or absence of other (object) clitics (cf. also Chillà & Citraro 2012). Under this analysis, the diatopic variation of the particle can be accounted for by the diatopic variation attested for the object clitics. Furthermore, it explains the relatively low position of the complementiser and its ability to co-occur with other complementisers. However,

this analysis does not explain why this combination of clitics should be associated with specific modal meanings. It is not clear how a cluster of personal pronouns should develop into an irrealis complementiser. Furthermore, as De Angelis (2016:80–1) argues, the different allomorphic manifestations of the complementisers are expected in an area such as Calabria, which is characterised by a high degree of diatopic variation in general. Finally, *mu* can co-occur with clitics, which shows that it occurs in a different position within the clause than the clitic pronouns. It will therefore be assumed in the remainder of this chapter that the vowels of *ma* and *mi* are to be derived from general phonological changes that have led to unstressed final vowels in these areas becoming [a] and [i] respectively, cf. *dumana/dumani* 'tomorrow', *vua/vui* 'you' (Rohlfs 1966:187–8).

3.5.7   Proposed grammaticalisation path

On the basis of the previous subsections, I conclude that QUOMODO is a more probable etymon for both *cu* and *mu* than the traditionally assumed QUOD and MODO (UT) for a variety of reasons. First, QUOMODO is used both as an irrealis complementiser and as a complementiser introducing final clauses. The same parallel with the Greek *(hi)na* '(in order) to' cannot be found with *modo.* Second, with regards to phonology, the patterns of RF can more easily be explained assuming QUOMODO rather than MODO (UT) as the etymon for *mu/ma/mi*. Third, the Old Salentino data pose no problem for the view that *cu* derives from *QUOMODO*; but under the view that *cu* derives from *QUOD,* it is necssary to assume that the merger of QUID and QUOD did not take place as in the rest of Romance. Also from a theoretical point of view, the unifying hypothesis seems less costly: it accounts more easily for the overlapping similarities between the Salentino and Calabrian varieties and does not presuppose a great difference between the Latin spoken in Salento and Calabria.

In this last part of the section, I will describe the grammaticalisation path that I propose that QUOMODO undergoes, resulting in *cu* and *mu.* As seen above, QUOMODO was originally a compound *wh*-element. It is therefore a phrasal element that in the course of the derivation moves to [Spec,CP] or, within the split CP, to [Spec,FocusP] (Rizzi 1997). On the other hand, *cu* and *mu* are functional heads that can occupy different positions along the clausal spine depending on the matrix verb that selects them. How can we account for this change?

Quomodo replaced *ut* in many contexts in late Latin. As discussed in §2.2.2, *ut* was lost as it had become weak both on a phonological and a semantic level. There was thus a gap in the complementation system, and other C-related elements took over the functions of *ut*. Given the shared meaning 'how' between *quomodo* and *ut,* it is not unexpected that *quomodo* by analogy took over the other functions of *ut,* including its function as a final and irrealis complementiser.

The reanalysis of the phrase *quomodo* as a head can be explained by the two economy principles discussed in §3.1: the Head over Phrase principle, according to which it is more economical for language-acquiring children to posit a head than a phrase (Van Gelderen 2004, 2009), and the Merge over Move (Roberts & Roussou 2002; cf. also Van Gelderen's (2009) Late Merge Principle), which states that it is less costly to merge an element in a higher position than to move it from a lower position within the tree. Acquirers of Latin saw *quomodo* as a synonym of *ut* when the latter was a *wh*-element. By analogy, they also extended *quomodo* to the other uses of *ut,* which had become both phonologically and semantically weak. In the case of irrealis complementisers, rather than moving a *wh*-element, it was more economical to posit a head which was directly merged into the C-domain with a [irrealis] feature. When reanalysed from phrase to head, its new head status lost some of its morphophonological structure (viz. > *quo* or >*mo(do)* as it became smaller in size, as expected.

Quomodo was however a more marked form to use as an irrealis complementiser than *quod/que*, which could be used with any type of complement, whereas final *quomodo* introduces irrealis (purpose) clauses. This was indeed what we see happening in other southern Italo-Romance varieties, where *quia* introduces epistemic and declarative complements (unless the left periphery is activated) and *quod/que* introduces all other complements. Why do the extreme southern Italian varieties opt for *quomodo* instead?

The choice for the more marked option must be linked to the influence of Greek. As is well known, the infinitive in Greek has been lost and replaced by a finite clause headed by the final complementiser *(hi)na* (see. e.g. Joseph 1983*)*. Typologically, infinitives tend to derive from purposive constructions, which in turn often derive from allative constructions, cf. English *to* and German *zu* (Haspelmath 1989), as well as the Romance *a/à* introducing irrealis infinitival clauses. Infinitives share with purposive clauses their irrealis, unrealised character (cf. Stowell 1982, Haspelmath 1989). It is therefore not surprising that when the infinitive disappeared, it was substituted by a final clause, albeit morphologically finite.

Intense language contact and widespread bilingualism has led to the structural extension of this phenomenon from Greek in the extreme southern Romance varieties. *Quomodo* is a perfect candidate to mirror *(hi)na*: apart from being used as an irrealis complementiser, it also has the purposive meaning that characterises *(hi)na*. *Quod/que*, on the other hand, is an unmarked clause linker.

Haspelmath (1989) argues for the following grammaticalisation path of infinitives from purposive clauses:

(60) Purposive > irrealis directive modality (manipulative and volitional verbs) > irrealis-potential (modals and evaluative verbs) > irrealis-(non)factive (thinking and verbs of utterance), factive (cognition and evaluative predicates).

On the basis of this hierarchy, we assume that the infinitive was first replaced by *quomodo* in purposive contexts, after which it was extended to irrealis complements in general. This is indeed confirmed by Ledgeway's (2013:200) results, who finds that purposive contexts after movement verbs such as 'come' and 'go' are replaced almost everywhere by finite complementation in Calabrian and Salentino; other irrealis-potential complements still (optionally) take the infinitive:

Table 3.3 Verbs selecting cu *and* mu *in Salentino and Calabrian (Ledgeway 2013:200)*

	Infinitive ←						→ *mu/cu*-complement			
Salentino	*Can*	*Hear*	*Must*	*Know*	*Make*	*Let*	*Aspect.s*	*Want*	*Come*	*Go*
Rohlfs ([1972] 1997e)	I	I		I/F	I/F	(I/)F		F		
Mancarella (1988)										
Brindisi	I	I	I	I	I			F		
Lecce	I	I		I				F		
Casarano (LE)	I			F	F			F		
Sternatia (LE)	I	F		F	F		F	F		
Martignano (LE)	I	F			F		F	F		
N.Sal. (Calabrese 1993)	I	I			I		I	F	F	
Scorrano (Musio 1995)	I	I	I	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	F	F	F
LE (Protopapa 1990-92)	I	I	I	I	I/F	I/F	I/F	F	F	F
Calabrese	*Can*	*Hear*	*Must*	*Make*	*Know*	*Let*	*Aspect.s*	*Want*	*Come*	*Go*
Rohlfs ([1972] 1997e)	I	I(/F)	I	I/F	(I/)F	(I/)F	F	F		F
Lombardi (1998)										
Tyrrhenian Coast	I		I				I/F	I/F	F	F
Ionian Coast	I/F		I/F				I/F	F	F	F
Cristofaro (1998)	I		I	I			I	F		
Boval. (Remberger 2011)	I		I/F	F				I/F		
Bovese	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	I/F	F

The grammaticalisation of *cu* and *mu* seems to follow the cross-linguistically frequent grammaticalisation path of infinitives. This means that *cu* and *mu* acquire the possibility of being merged in lower positions, not only in a C-related head (arguably Fin), but also in the T-domain.

In Calabria, there are also a few varieties (see also chapter 2, notes 6 and 18), closer to the isogloss, which arguably belong to transitional areas in the northern part of the area characterised by the presence of *mu*-clauses. This is confirmed by other word order diversions, e.g. negation following *mu* (61), subject following *mu* (62), reduplication of *mu* (Conflenti and Gizzeria, cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005:663-4) or the use of other tenses than the present in the *mu*-clause (Gizzeria, cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005:664):

(61) a. [tɛˈðiku   mu ur   u ˈcami]
        to.you=say.1SG MU NEG   him=call.2SG
        'I tell you not to call him.'

b. [tɛ ˈ ðiku   mu um ˈbiəni]

to.you=say.1SG MU NEG come.2SG

'I tell you not to come.'

(SCal., Conflenti (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005: 660)

(62) [vɔˈlɛra   mu ˈhrati-ta   unn ɛʃʃɛra]

want.COND   MU brother=your NEG   kill.COND.3SG

'I wish your brother would not kill.'

(SCal., Platania (CZ),(Manzini & Savoia 2005:664)

All these properties seem to indicate that in the dialects of this transitional area, *mu* can appear in a higher position than in the other dialects; it might be the case that *mu* appears with the syntax of *che* (Roberts & Roussou 2003:92n.7). The syntax of *che* probably represents an earlier stage of the grammaticalisation procress where QUOMODO has replaced QUOD in irrealis contexts but it has not yet grammaticalised further down, replacing the infinitive. Indeed, in Conflenti and Gizzeria, restructuring verbs such as 'want', 'can', as well as aspectuals and perception verbs, select an infinitive (Manzini & Savoia 2005:650).

According to Roberts & Roussou (2003), grammaticalisation leads to a movement 'upward' in the syntactic tree. They explain the change from *MODO UT* (in C) to *mu* (in T according to their analysis), as an upward movement of features (Roberts & Roussou 2003:97). The Mood features that were originally expressed by the subjunctive verb on T, are diachronically transferred from T to M(ood) as a consequence of the loss of inflection on the verb. They still admit that *modo* has lowered, and propose that it may have moved from an adjunct to a head position (Roberts & Roussou 2003:97n.8). This explanation cannot straightforwardly be extended to the case of Salentino *cu*, as in many Salentino varieties (at least some) verbs (in some persons and conjugations) still present distinctive subjunctive forms. In these varieties, mood is also still marked on the T head, as well as on the *cu* or *mu*. Furthermore, as we have seen in the previous section, *cu* and *mu* can lexicalise different positions along the clausal spine. When lexicalising a T- or *v*-related position, the modal features are lexicalised in these domains and hence lower than the CP. This therefore seems a case of downward grammaticalisation: *QUO(MODO) > cu* and *QUO(MODO) > mu* are reanalysed as occupying C-, T- or *v*-related positions. They therefore constitute an exception to the generalisation made by Roberts & Roussou (2003).

If we compare the proposed grammaticalisation path of QUOMODO into Salentino *cu* and southern Calabese *mu* with the generalisations about complementiser grammaticalisation (Narrog & Heine 2017:10), we see some similarities but also differences. QUOMODO did indeed undergo decategorialisation (*cu* and *mu* have lost their *wh*-feature); it did undergo phonetic erosion; it is no longer a transparent, compound form; it has lost its internal complexity (23e).

However, as already mentioned above, the first generalisation does not hold: *cu* and *mu* derive from a *wh*-element that in Latin was already used as a C-element to introduce both purpose clauses and irrealis complements. This step had already taken place in Latin: if we consider the history of QUOMODO, the generalisation holds as *quomodo* originally meant 'in which way'. Also the desemanticisation is not fully completed. Apart from being irrealis subordinators, *cu* and *mu* can still be used to introduce purpose clauses, albeit sometimes reinforced into *pemmu* 'in order to' (Rohlfs 1969:193) and *in motu cu* 'in order to' (Calabrese 1993:35). In that sense, *cu* and *mu* are still ambiguous, in line with generalisation (23c).

In sum, based on evidence from Latin, cross-linguistic parallels and data from old Salentino, I have argued that QUOMODO is a more probable etymon for both *cu* and *mu* than QUOD and MODO (UT) respectively. QUOMODO replaced UT as an interrogative, and by analogy also as a (final) complementiser. This made QUOMODO similar to Greek *hina*, and a good candidate to express the purposive meaning of non-finite forms. QUOMODO started out as a purposive marker, with verbs such as 'come' and 'go', but also grammaticalised further down along the clausal spine to head complements to functional verbs. This further grammaticalisation did not take place in the areas in the northernmost part of southern Calabria. Here, *QUOMODO > mu* has a syntax more similar to QUOD > *che*, which results in differences in word order with respect to negation and subjects, as well as the use of other tenses than the perfect.

3.6 Romanian *să*

Să (in Old Romanian also written as *se*) is standardly argued to derive from the Latin conditional complementiser *si* 'if' (Sandfeld 1930:173; Herman 1963:63; Jordan 2009:25; Nicolae 2015; Zafiu et al. 2016). The semantic change that *să* has undergone from conditional complementiser to subordinating subjunctive particle is however unclear (Zafiu et al. 2016:15). Frîncu (1969) and Hill (2013) argue that *SI* became an irrealis complementiser and later a mood marker. On the other hand, Zafiu et al. (2016:15) argue that it is more likely that *să* also had a purposive meaning in old Romanian, derived from the Latin adverbial use of *SI(C)*. Here, we propose that it is this latter homophony between the conditional complementiser and the adverbial *se/si* from *SI(C)* that is crucial for the development of *să*. The adverbial *SE/SI(C)* was used to introduce purposive clauses, as modern-day *să* does. Second, in some varieties, *să* is homophonous to, or can be replaced by, *și* 'and, too' (Nedelcu et al. 2016:17). We will therefore assume that the element **se*, resulting from the homophony between Latin *si* and *SI(C)* has grammaticalised into the subjunctive subordinating particle *să.* This element was marked for [irrealis] and could also introduce purposive clauses, as it still does today, and it mirrors the irrealis/purposive nature of infinitives (cf. Haspelmath 1989).

The change of *se* into a subjunctive marker had already taken place by the 16th century (cf. Hill 2013: 566; Zafiu et al. 2016: 14), so before the disappearance of *se* as a conditional complementiser; in fact, in old Romanian, the two coexist for a certain period (in the 16th century, Zafiu 2016; Nicolae 2015:133). Conditional *se* is used in a manner very similar to that of its etymon, introducing the protasis with different moods expressing the degree of (im)probability of the realisation of the condition. This distinction between levels of probability continues into old Romanian, where *se* introduces conditional clauses until the 18th century, even though the employed moods and tenses differ from Latin (Gheorghe et al. 2016:530ff.). It was eventually abandoned in favour of *deacă (> dacă)* or *de* (ibidem).

The two uses of *se/să* show syntactic differences. As a conditional complementiser it is not necessarily adjacent to the verb (cf. 63a) and can select an indicative verb form (cf. 63b). In contrast, subjunctive *se/să* always appears adjacent to the verbal complex, only negation and proclitics can intervene (Nicolae 2015:133; 2019). Examples are given in (63) for the conditional *să*:

(63) a. *Să cu limbi omenești și îngerești așu grăi.*
　　　　 if with languages human and angelic AUX.COND.1SG speak.INF
　　　　 'If I would speak with human and angelic voices'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(ORo. CC².1581: 337 apud Nicolae 2015:133)

　　 b. *Iară, să ne vom bate cu Moldova, noi să lăsăm turcii.*
　　　　 but if us=AUX.FUT.1PL fight.INF with Moldova, we SA leave.SBJV.1PL turks.DET
　　　　 'And if we fight against Moldova, we should leave the Turks.'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(ORo. DÎ.1600: XXXII *apud* Nicolae 2015:133, 2019)

These examples show that conditional *să* occupies Force and permits the generation of a left periphery (Hill 2013:570; Nicolae 2015:133).

Să in old and modern Romanian generally replaces the infinitive in complementation, leading to a change that is attested in most of the Balkan languages (Sandfeld 1930; Joseph 1983)[6]. Indeed, Romanian employs finite complements introduced by *să* where most other Romance languages would use an infinitive, even in cases where the embedded subject is coreferential with the matrix subject and in which other Romance languages show the obviation effect. However, the

---

[6] Scholars disagree whether language contact is the cause of the loss of the infinitive in the Balkans (cf. Sanfeld 1930, who proposes the loss of the infinitive started in Greek and spread through the Balkan area); whether only language internal factors caused the change (cf. a.o. Frîncu 1969, Hill 2013); or a combination of the two (e.g. Joseph 1983). It is remarkable that in the Phanariot periods, which historically were characterised by intense contact with Greek, the infinitive is used more than before (Frîncu 1969). We can therefore exclude the hypothesis that it is a pure borrowing from Greek.

infinitive is not a verb form unknown to Modern Romanian, and is still regularly used with modal verbs such as *putea* and in temporal and modal periphrases (cf. Zafiu 2013).

The pathway of this replacement has been described by Hill (2013), who argues that the replacement of the infinitive by *să*-clauses has not occurred as straightforwardly as is generally assumed. The so-called 'long' infinitives in –*re,* which derive directly from Latin, were reanalysed as nominal forms. Consequently, these infinitives were replaced by *short* infinitives (without –*re*) headed by the infinitival complementiser *a*[7] (64), or by a finite indicative clause headed by *de* (65):

(64) *S-au   gătit   **a stare**   cu   războiŭ împrotiva   lui Răzvan.*
     REFL=have.3SG prepared   to stand.INF with   war   against   GEN Razvan
     'He prepared himself to wage war against Razvan.'

<div align="right">(ORo. Costin 16 apud Hill 2013: 554)</div>

(65) *Au   poruncitŭ **de** au   făcut un sicreiu.*
     have.3SG   ordered   of have.3PL made a   coffin
     'He ordered (them) to make a coffin.'

<div align="right">(ORo. Ureche 1958: 178 apud Hill 2013: 560)</div>

Only in a later stage were *de*-indicatives and the *a*-infinitives (albeit to a lesser extent) replaced by subjunctive clause with *să*. This was possible because *să* had become a general [irrealis] marker which could also head purposive adjuncts. This purposive feature is similar to infinitival clauses, and therefore this marker is used to replace the infinitive, on a par with QUOMODO in SCal. and Sal.. The grammaticalisation of *să* differs, however, from that of *cu* and *mu* because Old Romanian *se, a result of the merger of SI(C) and the hypothetical complementiser SI, is already a C-related head. Rizzi (2001) argues Italian *se* is located in IntP. We can assume the same for Latin SI. We have argued above that Romanian *să* on the other hand is in Fin. Subjunctive *se/să* is lower than conditional *să* (see above). This secondary grammaticalisation would then represent a downward grammaticalisation.

Roberts and Roussou argue that the grammaticalisation of Greek *na* and Calabrian *mu* are not cases of downward grammaticalisation, because the modality features are no longer realised in the I-domain (on verbs) but in the C-domain (*na* is in Fin and can optionally move to C). This can also be said about Romanian (except for 3rd person subjunctives which do present a distinct morphological verb form, and can under certain circumstances be realised without *să*). However, originally SI/*se* as a conditional marker is merged in a higher position than subjunctive *să* (which

---

[7] The emergence of the infinitival complementiser AD is widespread in Romance in general, cf. §3.3.

could be in Fin or the I-domain). We still have the grammaticalised element 'moving down', in the sense that it is reanalysed as lexicalising a lower head in the tree. This is in line with the pattern that also emerged in the previous sections of this chapter.

The other complementisers of Romanian also derive from Latin C-elements. *Ca* is usually said to derive from QUIA (Hill 2013). However, QUIA in Latin did not have final meaning and was not employed with comparatives, as Romanian *ca* is (Herman 1963:157). Given its use as a comparative preposition *ca mine* 'as me', we assume the etymon QUA(M). This also yielded *ca* in many varieties spoken in Italy (Herman 1963:157–60).

Că on the other hand is argued to be a result of QUOD (Hill 2013:553; Maiden 2016:119; Zafiu et al. 2016:466), even though the change from a final –*o* to –*ă* seems quite problematic.[8] Final [o] would have yielded [u] in Romanian. Furthermore, these vowels have regularly been lost (cf. –*(u)lu* msg. article becoming –*(u)l*). This might explain why *quod* was lost in Romanian and replaced by *quia*, which has a similar function in Latin as a realis complementiser. Final, unstressed –*ă* is usually the result of a final [a] in Latin; cf. first declension nouns such as CASA > *casă* 'house'. A more probable etymon for *că* is QU(I)A, which would regularly develop into *că*. Second, the use of *quia* with almost exclusively declarative and epistemic verbs in Latin corresponds to the use of *că* as an indicative complementiser in Modern Romanian. This development is paralleled by the complementiser *ca* in central and southern Italian varieties, which typically introduces declarative and epistemic complements (see §3.41).

3.7 Irrealis complementisers grammaticalise downwards

In this section a clear pattern has emerged. Irrealis complementisers generally derive from elements that were located in the high C-domain in Latin, but which came to occupy a lower position in the same domain, viz. Fin, such as USID *che,* and *să. Cu* and *mu* derive from QUOMODO, a *wh*-element originally located in the specifier of Focus which gets reanalysed as a head (cf. Van Gelderen 2004's Spec-to-Head principle) and from there it moves down along the clausal spine. In chapter 2 it has been shown that *cu* and *mu* can occupy *Fin*, but they can also head reduced clauses which are not CPs. *Cu* and *mu* have subsequently grammaticalised further down the clausal spine when these subjunctives replaced the infinitives also in complements to functional verbs, which are reduced complements. *Cu* and *mu* thus came to head smaller complements.

There are some striking similarities between some of the grammaticalisation paths, as well as some differences. All three varieties with Balkan-style complementation have grammaticalised a C-element that was in one way or another already marked for [irrealis] modality and could appear in purposive clauses. Due to contact with Greek (or other Balkan languages), the varieties

---

[8] But compare *după* < DEPOS(T) 'after'.

examined replaced the infinitive with these irrealis clauses, starting from purposive clauses, extending the complementiser to volitional and directive verbs, as well as modals (apart from Salentino). The degree to which infinitival complementation has been replaced differs across varieties; it has progressed further in Romanian and Calabrian than in Salentino. However, it is only in Calabrian and Salentino that this further grammaticalisation leads to decategorialisation: in these varieties, *cu* and *mu* can lexicalise a functional head not only in the C-domain, but also in the T- and *v*-domain. In USIDs and Romanian we see a change of position but the relevant elements remain part of the C-domain and can thus be considered complementisers.

In the generative approach to grammaticalisation as discussed above, grammaticalisation is considered as an *upward* process (Roberts & Roussou 2003): the lexical material or functional material is reanalysed as merged directly into a higher position within the clause instead of moving there. Apparent 'downward' changes involve loss of movement; these are not instances of grammaticalisation and have the following properties which distinguish them from actual cases of grammaticalisation (Roberts & Roussou 2003:208):

(i)   Apply to all members of category Y;

(ii)   Do not change the category of Y;

(iii)   Involve no semantic or phonological change to Y-roots;

(iv)   Cannot be cyclic.

Taking the diachrony of *che, cu*, *mu* and *să* into consideration, we see that these properties are not attested. The proposed grammaticalisation path does not apply to all C-elements (cf. *ca, că, chi*, which are still in Force), but only to the subset of *irrealis* complementisers in these varieties. The etyma QUOMODO and SI(C) do change in category; particularly in the case of QUOMODO, as *mu* and *cu* can occupy positions in the *v*- and I-domain as well. We find both semantic bleaching and morphophonological erosion in the grammaticalisation path. Point (iv) also seems to be disconfirmed by the further development of *cu* and *mu*, which can appear in lower positions in the clause as well, not just within the C-domain. The elements investigated are thus proper instances of grammaticalisation and cannot be dismissed as cases of loss of movement.

Roberts and Roussou (2003:97) note the problematic status of *mu* (and Greek *na*). They argue that the grammaticalisation of Greek *na* and Calabrian *mu* are not cases of downward grammaticalisation, because the modality features are no longer realised in the I-domain (on verbs) but in the C-domain (*na* is in Fin and can optionally move to C). In this sense, the features have moved upwards and the direction of the change is still upward grammaticalisation. Indeed, the Calabrian varieties do not present a separate paradigm for subjunctive forms; after *mu*, regular indicative verb forms are employed.

A similar situation is found in Romanian, where only the 3rd person subjunctives present a distinct morphological verb form, and can under certain circumstances be realised without *să*. However, even ignoring these 3rd person markings, since originally SI/*se* as a conditional marker is merged in a higher position than subjunctive *să* (which could be in Fin or the I-domain), there is still a grammaticalised element 'moving down' in the sense that it is reanalysed as lexicalising a lower head in the tree. Roberts and Roussou's solution cannot straightforwardly be extended to the case of Salentino *cu* either, as in many Salentino varieties (at least some) verbs still present distinctive subjunctive forms (Bertocci & Damonte 2007). In these varieties, mood is still marked on the T head, as well as on *cu* or *mu*. Furthermore, as we have seen in chapter 2, *cu* can lexicalise different positions along the clausal spine. When lexicalising a T- or *v*-related position, the modal features are lexicalised in these domains, hence lower than the CP.

In the history of irrealis complementisers, therefore, there are many cases of downward grammaticalisation: *ke(d) > che*irrealis, SI(C) > *să*, QUO(MODO) > *cu* and (QUO)MODO > *mu* are reanalysed to a lower position within the C-domain, and, in the case of *mu* and *cu,* to T- or *v*-related positions as well. The diachrony of all four subordinators therefore constitutes an exception to the generalisation made by Roberts & Roussou (2003). The question arises why specifically *irrealis* complementisers seem to grammaticalise downwards. They seem to all move to Fin, and when heading complements to functional verbs, to lower positions. Fin is the head that has traditionally been associated with both finiteness and mood (Rizzi 1997:283). As we will see in chapter 4, non-finite verbs tend to move close to this position. It will be argued in chapter 5 that this is the locus of the indirect anchoring that characterises both infinitival and subjunctive clauses, which are both less finite. The subordinator expressing this lower degree of finiteness is thus expected to be realised in this position, rather than in the higher heads of the C-domain which relate to clause-typing.

Second, functional complements, which are smaller in Romance, often pattern together with irrealis complements, being realised by infinitives or subjunctives. These complements are reduced and the elements introducing them will appear in lower positions in the clause. When *sa, cu* and *mu* come to substitute the infinitive not only after lexical verbs, but as functional complements as well, they will move down.

Finally, it should be noted that having a specific complementiser for irrealis is a marked option. Not all varieties mark irrealis in the C-domain. In fact, many Romance varieties do not have a dedicated irrealis complementiser. Furthermore, many SIDs have generalised one of the two complementisers which is now the unmarked option.

4. Conclusion: changes in finiteness?

In this chapter, I have examined the development of irrealis complementisers from Latin to Romance. The starting point has been the Classical Latin complementation system, which makes great use of non-finite complementation, especially of the so-called *Accusativus cum Infinitivo,* typically used in realis contexts. In addition, it has a factive finite complementiser *quod* (and to a lesser extent, *quia*) and an irrealis complementiser *ut* (with its negative counterparts *ne* and *ut non*). This system changes radically in the transition to Romance, as the *AcI* disappears, as well as the irrealis complementiser *ut*. This co-occurs with an extension of the complementiser *quod,* which becomes almost a universal complementiser, losing its more marked [factive] feature and heading both realis and irrealis clauses. By analogy with *quod, quia* also gains ground as a complementiser, but its use is limited to complements to declarative and epistemic verbs.

In most Romance varieties, *que* (<*QUED), arguably a result of the merger of (the functions of) *quod* and (the form of) *quid*, remains as the only complementiser available. Other Romance varieties feature a dual complementiser system, such as central and southern Italian varieties, which present an opposition between the complementiser *ca* (<QUIA) and the complementiser *chi/che* (< *QUED). In older stages of these languages, the two complementisers are sensitive not only to the embedded mood (*ca* appears only with epistemic and declarative verbs), but also to the activation of the left-periphery (*che* appears with both indicative and subjunctive clauses whenever there is a left-peripheral element). Instead, in modern USIDs, the complementisers correlate purely with the modal distinction, or, more frequently, one of the two has been generalised.

Other dual complementiser systems are attested in Romanian, southern Calabrian and Salentino. Here the irrealis subordinator also replaces the canonical uses of the Romance infinitive. It has been argued that Sal. *cu* and SCal. *mu*, contrary to traditional views, both derive from the same etymon, viz. QUOMODO 'how'. Given the Latin evidence and the similarities between Calabrian *mu* and Salentino *cu*, this seems a more convincing etymology for these particles then the generally accepted *MODO* and *QUOD* respectively. Ro. *să* on the other hand derives from the merger of the conditional complementiser SI and the purposive complementiser *SI(C).*

The grammaticalisation of these different irrealis markers has shown that although they form a heterogeneous category and derive from different etyma, there is a general pattern in their diachrony: they all grammaticalise downwards. They typically derive from high C-heads, which move towards the lowest position of the C-domain, viz. *Fin*, which, as I will argue in chapter 5, is related to anchoring of the clause. The irrealis complementisers all have in common that they mark indirect anchoring in the clause. *Cu* and *mu* subsequently grammaticalise further down to head complements to functional verbs, on a par with reflexes of AD and DE.

At first glance, there seems to have been a change in the degree of finiteness, as in Romanian, southern Calabrian and Salentino, infinitival structures have been replaced with seemingly finite structures (the so-called *impopolarità dell'infinito*, cf. Rohlfs 1969: 102-106). The Balkan-style subjunctive is indeed more finite under a traditional morphological view of finiteness (cf. discussion in chapter 1), but, as I will argue in chapter 5, on a syntactic level, the Balkan-style subjunctive is less finite and behaves in many ways as a non-finite form: the interpretation of the subject and the temporal properties (the anchoring of person and tense) depend on the matrix verb. So, even if a morphologically non-finite form such as the infinitive is replaced by a morphologically more finite form (i.e. the subjunctive), these properties of the complement clause do not change, as they ultimately depend on the matrix verb selecting the clause in question, and we do not have a increase in the degree of *syntactic* finiteness.

4. Verb movement in non- and less-finite clauses

1. Introduction: verb movement in generative grammar

Following the discussion of the functional structure in less-finite clauses in chapter 2, this chapter focuses on another property of less-finite and non-finite clauses: the position of the verb. Verb movement has been widely studied within generative linguistics, mostly in Romance and in Germanic. It has been shown that there is a contrast between Romance and English, as in the former the finite verb moves into the I-domain, but not in the latter (Emonds 1978; Pollock 1989; Belletti 1990; Giorgi & Pianesi 1996; Zanuttini 1997b; Cinque 1999; Schifano 2018). The cartographic approach has tried to establish a more precise analysis of the landing site of the finite verb. Cinque (1999:152) argues that Italian finite verbs move past *mica* 'not (at all)' and all lower adverbs; it can optionally precede or follow all higher adverbs. He also gives examples of gerunds, active and passive past participles, absolute participles and other non-finite forms moving to different positions within the I-domain. The generalisation that thus emerged is that Romance verb movement targets the I-domain, albeit different positions.

Building on Cinque's (1999) approach, Schifano (2018) gives a fine-grained picture of finite verb movement, dividing the Romance languages into four macrotypes based on the height of their verb movement. She convincingly shows that the position targeted by the finite verb correlates with the *paradigmatic instantiation* (PI) of mood, tense and aspect within a given variety, which is defined as follows: "mood, tense or aspect are paradigmatically instantiated in the language if their chief values are expressed by synthetic and non-syncretic paradigms" (Schifano 2018:136). So, whenever a language expresses mood, tense or aspect substantially through the morphology of the verbal paradigms, this category is paradigmatically instantiated. Conversely, if the morphology does not express the category, a syntactic strategy is employed: the TAM-interpretation must be licensed through overt verb movement to the relevant field (Schifano 2018:136–137). For instance, Spanish and Catalan, both languages with low verb movement, express all three categories through synthetic and non-syncretic paradigms. The morphological strategy to license TAM interpretation is thus adopted. On the other hand, in French and Romanian, none of these categories are paradigmatically instantiated, leading to higher verb movement in these varieties. The correlation between PI of mood, tense and aspect and verb movement is summarised in the following table (Schifano 2018:166):

Table 4.1PI of TAM and verb movement typology (Schifano 2018:166)

Movement typology	PI of TAM
high (French)	Mood [-PI]
medial (N.Reg. Italian)	Mood [+PI], Tense [-PI]
low (E. Portuguese)	Mood [+PI], Tense [+PI], Aspect [-PI]
very low (Spanish)	Mood [+PI], Tense [+PI], Aspect [+PI]

This generalisation however only concerns finite matrix verb forms. The question that is relevant to the present research is how finiteness influences the presence and the height of verb movement. Schifano (2018:chap. 5) also discusses infinitives and subjunctives, as well as past participles; however, other types of non-finite clauses have not been studied systematically before, which is the aim of this chapter.

Roberts (2019) embeds Schifano's PI approach in a bigger parameter hierarchy. All clauses contain an event variable that needs to be bound by Tense (although there is cross-linguistic variation with respect to the anchoring category, (cf. Ritter & Wiltschko 2014). Verb placement is a consequence of the denotation of events through tense, which can happen via *Agree*, or *Agree* and *Move*. Romance languages, being strong tense languages, move the finite verb into the TAM field. This movement is the reflex of a mesoparameter. However, this hierarchy does not say anything about the movement of non-finite verbs; the question is whether we find the same event denotation mechanism as in finite clauses, and thus the same movement.

Apart from the exact location of verbs, the *trigger* of verb movement has been central to the study of generative syntax as well. One particular idea has been around from the very beginning: verbs move to the I-domain to 'pick up' their inflection. Inflectionally richer languages have higher verb movement than languages with poor agreement paradigms (cf. Vikner 1995; Koeneman 2001; Koeneman & Zeijlstra 2014, a.o.). The correlation between richness of paradigms and verb movement has, however, many well-known exceptions (Rohrbacher 1999; Wiklund et al. 2007) and has been rejected by various scholars (cf. Schifano 2018 a.o.). The hypothesis is very interesting for the current chapter, as finiteness is traditionally defined on the basis of presence or absence of subject-verb agreement and inflectional features (see chapter 1). We might therefore expect a relationship between finiteness and verb movement. The rich agreement hypothesis would predict that non-finite forms do not move high, with the exception of *inflected* non-finite forms. If verb movement occurs independently of agreement, this might be an argument against taking subject-verb agreement as the sole trigger for it.

Another proposal linking paradigm 'richness' to verb movement can be found in Biberauer and Roberts (2010).[1] If a language has enough tense oppositions in synthetic forms, it is rich and shows verb movement in simple finite clauses. In these languages, a verb is merged as a V+T compound which needs to merge both with the V-complement and the T-complement in order to form a VP and TP respectively. Movement is triggered by the inherent features of this verbal complex; the richness of the tense paradigm causes the formation of the V+T compound in the Numeration (Biberauer & Roberts 2010: 267-268). The proposals linking verb movement to richness of the paradigms, however valid, are all focused on the movement of finite verbs in main clauses; they do not address the movement of non-finite verb forms.

With regards to Romance infinitives specifically, it has been argued that infinitives and subjunctives move to the highest relevant position in the I-domain to license a [-realis] feature (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; 2014; Schifano 2018:230–239). This cannot however be the trigger for movement in all types of non-finite clauses, as they are not all irrealis, as we will see below.

This chapter aims to trace and analyse verb movement in various types of non-finite and semi-finite clauses in Romance, including infinitives with specified subjects, inflected infinitives, bare infinitival clauses, Aux-to-Comp (cf. Rizzi 1982), past participial clauses and the Romanian supine. All these forms head their own clause; non-finite forms in periphrases or monoclausal constructions are not analysed here. The results will shed light on the role of agreement and morphological richness in triggering verb movement, as non-finite forms are *usually* lacking agreement and TAM inflection. The chapter is structured as follows: §2 discusses the main diagnostics that will be used; §3 discusses the verb movement of the different types of less-finite forms; §4 contains the analysis of this verb movement. §5 concludes the chapter with a discussion of the relation between verb movement and finiteness.

2. Testing verb movement: diagnostics

In order to establish the exact location of the verb, there are a series of diagnostics that can be used. In this section, the diagnostics will be briefly explained before being applied to the various non-finite and semi-finite clauses in Romance. The diagnostics include the relative position of the verb and different types of adverbs; the position of left-peripheral elements wrt the verb; subject and object positions; and clitic placement.

---

[1] See however Cyrino (2013) on Brazilian Portuguese, which lacks high movement but has the same tense paradigm as European Portuguese. However, if one takes into consideration aspectual oppositions, the same prediction could be made for V-to-Asp movement (Biberauer, p.c.).

2.1 Subject positions

The relative position of the verb and its arguments can be used as a diagnostic for verb movement; the position of the subject especially will be informative in case of movement into the I-domain. Obligatory inversion is often seen as an indication of movement into the CP, across the subject (e.g. with Aux-to-Comp, see §3.4). However, we need to keep in mind that the subject can occupy various lower positions itself.

Since the predicate-internal subject hypothesis (Koopman & Sportiche 1986; 1991), it is generally assumed that subjects are first merged in [spec,VP] and can move from there to higher positions. Cardinaletti (2004) gives an overview of preverbal subject positions within the IP:

(1)   specSubjP specEPPP specAgrSP … specVP

According to this approach, the traditional notion of 'subject' is connected to properties of a series of functional heads in the I-domain. This idea is combined with the specialisation hypothesis, i.e. the hypothesis that different types of subjects check different types of features and therefore occupy different subject positions (Cardinaletti 2004: 126). As schematised in (1), the highest subject position is the specifier of SubjP, where the so-called 'subject of predication' is located. Here XPs occur without necessarily checking Nominative. This functional projection is connected to the semantic notion of subject, but not necessarily to Nominative or verb agreement, such as is the case of the subjects of psych verbs, predicate fronting in inverse copular sentences and locative PPs. This is the location of strong pronouns and weak pronouns (*egli* 'he'/*esso* 'it') in Italian. Other weak pronouns and the silent pronoun *pro* are on the other hand located in the specifier of AgrSP, which can be ulteriorly split up into positions for different φ-features. The XP merged in this position agrees with the verb. Finally, there is spec,EPPP, where the EPP is located and which assigns Nominative Case.

Moreover, a preverbal subject can be analysed as the 'canonical' position, i.e. what we conventionally call [Spec,TP] (cf. AgrSP in Cardinaletti's (2004) overview), but also as a higher position somewhere in the C(omplementiser)-domain of the clause (for instance, TopicP) (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), who argue that all preverbal subjects in Romance are topics).

When necessary, floating quantifiers will be used to show positions of the subject, as these show the positions a subject (or object) has moved through. If, on the other hand, no floating quantifiers are possible, subjects might very well have remained in a low position. This information can than be combined with evidence from adverb placement.

2.2 Adverbs

As discussed in chapter 1, adverbs lexicalise the specifier positions of a series of functional heads in the I-domain, which occur in the same order cross-linguistically (Cinque 1999). They are generally divided into the higher adverb space (HAS, "higher adverbs" in Cinque's (1999) terms), comprising the adverbs from Mood$_{speechact}$ to Mod$_{volitional}$, and lower adverbs (LAS, or "lower pre-VP adverbs" in Cinque (1999)), which include all adverbs lower than Mod$_{volitional}$, comprising mostly aspectual projections and Voice (Cinque 1999; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005:81ff.; Ledgeway & Roberts forthcoming). By testing the relative order between the verb and the adverb in its neutral, intonationally-flat position, we can establish the height of verb movement (Pollock 1989; Belletti 1990; Cinque 1999; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; Schifano 2015; 2018).[2] A prediction that this hierarchy makes is that if a verb form can precede a certain adverb, it can also precede all lower adverbs. Similarly, if a verb form cannot precede a certain adverb, it should not be able to precede higher adverbs either.

2.3 Topic and focus

A more fine-grained view of the CP as proposed by Rizzi (1997) allows us to further investigate the exact final position of the verb of what is traditionally called V-to-C movement. Does C in that case correspond to Force or a lower position within the left periphery, e.g. Fin? Medieval Romance showed verb movement to Fin or Force (cf. Wolfe 2019 and references therein), so we might expect to find similar movements in the cases that have been analysed as V-to-C, such as Aux-to-Comp (§3.4) or past participial clauses (§3.6).

The location of the verb can be established on the basis of the relative order of the verb and left-peripheral elements such as complementisers, topics and foci. If the verb necessarily precedes both topics and foci, we can conclude that the verb is in the highest C-head; if not, we expect the verb to be lower. But a caveat is required here: as extensively shown by Belletti (2004), there is also a lower periphery above the VP. When considering topics and foci, a distinction should be made between the two peripheries and their availability.

---

[2] It has been noted in the literature that high adverbs can appear in postverbal position and apparently do not always respect the Cinque hierarchy; some of them can appear in postverbal position when deaccented or when followed by other material (Tescari Neto 2012:20–21). However, this is only apparent: due to their focalising use, they can attract their complement (over which they have scope) to their specifier. This remnant movement gives us the impression that V can move over the abverb but it is not a case of genuine V-movement.

2.4 Clitic placement

Romance clitic pronouns are of the adverbal type, i.e. they generally cliticise onto a verb (but see Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005) for examples where adverbs can intervene between the clitic and the verb). They can appear in proclisis (2), enclisis (3), and, more rarely, in mesoclisis (4):

(2) *Pierre   la rencontre.*
     Pierre   her=meet.3SG
     'Pierre meets her.'

(Fr.)

(3) *Pietro decide   di incontrarla.*
     Pietro decide.3SG of   meet.INF=her
     'Pietro decides to meet her.'

(It.)

(4) *Escrevê-lo-ei.*
     write=it=FUT.1SG
     'I will write it.'

(EuPt., Roberts 2016:797)

In many Romance languages, such as Italian and Spanish, the alternation between proclisis and enclisis is determined by the finiteness of the verb: clitics appear in proclisis on finite verbs and in enclisis on non-finite verbs. There are however many other patterns attested, e.g., in French, the clitics appear in enclisis only with positive imperatives. Other Romance languages show enclisis on finite verbs, such as European Portuguese (5a) and Galician, as well as the northern Italian variety of Borgomanerese (5b) (cf. Tortora 2014):

(5)   a. *O Pedro   encontrou-a.*
          the Pedro   meet.PRET.3SG=her.
          'Pedro met her.'

(EuPt., Roberts 2016:795)

       b. *La môngia-la.*
          she=eat.3SG=it
          'She eats it'.

(NIDs, Borgomanerese (NO), Tortora 2010:137)

In European Portuguese and Galician, a remnant of the Tobler-Mussafia law is attested: a sentence cannot have a clitic in first position. This means that in positive declarative matrix clauses, the clitic has to appear in enclisis (Uriagereka 1995; Raposo & Uriagereka 2005). In other contexts, including negated clauses, embedded clauses and clauses with operators in the left-periphery, the clitic appears in proclisis on finite verbs.

There are many different approaches within generative syntax to the placement of clitics. Here, it will be assumed that there are two positions where clitics can move to: one higher one, in the IP, and a lower one (in the VP) (Benincà & Tortora 2010; Roberts 2010), which cannot usually be active at the same time. As non-branching heads, clitics are at the same time heads as well as maximal projections (Chomsky 1995). Depending on the position of the verb, the clitic is in one of the two structural positions, cliticises in proclisis or enclisis onto the verb.

3. Testing verb movement in non-/semi-finite clauses: results

3.1 Personal infinitives

Even though the licensing of overt, nominative subjects is typically considered a feature of finite clauses, almost all Romance languages present infinitives with specified lexical subjects distinct from the matrix clause subject, which we will refer to as 'personal infinitives' (cf. Ledgeway 1998; 2000:chap. 4; Mensching 2000 a.o.). This section will discuss verb movement of personal infinitives in Spanish, Catalan, southern Italian dialects, Sardinian, and Romanian. Inflected infinitives featuring person-number agreement will be discussed in the following section (§3.2).

In most Romance languages, personal infinitives are limited to unselected clauses, such as adjuncts and subject clauses. These are usually non-control contexts, restricted to marking non-coreferentiality (Ledgeway 2000:123). This is the case in Spanish (Torrego 1998; Hernanz 1999), Catalan (Hualde 1992:38–9; Rigau 1995; Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:399; Ledgeway 2000; Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016), SIDs (Ledgeway 2000:116–7), Sardinian[3] (Blasco Ferrer 1988; Jones 1992; Mensching 2000:32–33; Virdis 2015), and Romanian. Some representative examples have been given for adjuncts (6) and subject clauses (7):[4]

(6)　a.　*Després d'arribar　nosaltres,　va　　　començar　la reunió.*
　　　　　after　of arrive.INF we　　　go.3SG　　start.INF　the meeting

---

[3] Some Logudorese varieties also feature optional inflection on the infinitive. These inflected infinitives will be left aside for now and will be the object of investigation in the following section (§3.2)

[4] Please note that in the remainder of this chapter, only representative examples from one or two languages will be given due to space limitations. However, all relevant examples have been collected and are available upon request.

'After we arrived, the meeting started.'

(Cat., Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016:1296–7)

b. *Primme de succedere   chesto,   ha   ditto che   fa   cose de pazze!*
before   of happen.INF this,   have.3SG said that do.3SG   things of crazy
'Before this happens, he said he'll get up to wild things!'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:116)

c. *Est   andau   aicci e tottu chene   dhi donai   su premissu   su babbu.*
be.3SG gone   here and all without to.him=give.INF   the permission   the father
'He has gone anyway without his father giving him the permission.'

(Campidanese Srd., Virdis 2015:466–7)

(7) a. *Cummene   a ce ne parla   tu.*
be.better.3SG   to LOC=PART=speak.INF you.SG
'It is better for you to speak about it with him.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:117)

b. *Su de t'inci   essi   andau   aicci allestru   tui   mi fait   feli   meda.*
the of you=PART   be.INF gone   thus   hurriedly you to.me=make.3SG   anger much
 'The fact that you went away in such a hurry made me quite mad.'

(Camp. Srd., Virdis 2015:469)

c. *E   important a decide   tu   însuţi.*
be.3SG important to decide.INF   you.SG   yourself
'It is important for you yourself to decide.'

(Ro., Pană Dindelegan 2013a:216)

Conversely, complement clauses in Romance generally cannot contain personal infinitives. There are however exceptions to this generalisation. In Sicilian and Sardinian, personal infinitives are found in complements (Bentley 2014; Jones 1992; Jones 1993; Sitaridou 2002; Virdis 2015):[5]

---

[5] Both Romanian and Spanish marginally allow personal infinitives in complements, although this is subject to interspeaker variation:

(i) *Dos testigos   declararon   [ser tú/yo/él/ella   cómplice   del robo].*
two testimonies   declare.PRET.3PL   be.INF you.NOM/I.NOM/he/she accomplice of.the theft
 'Two testimonies declared that you/I/he/she were/was an accomplice in the theft.'

(Sp., Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:2001)

(ii) *Ion se teme   a nu-l   apuca   iarna   cu   casa   neterminată.*
Ion REFL=fear.3SG to NEG=him overtake.INF   winter.DET with   house.DET unfinished
 'Ion is afraid of winter overtaking him with the house unfinished. '

(Ro., Pană Dindelegan 2013a:216)

(8) a. *Si dicinu   di tu   mangiarmi, mi mangi.*

    if   say.3PL   of you.SG eat.INF=me, me=eat.2SG

    'If they say that you should eat me, you will eat me.'

<div align="right">(Sic., Bentley 2014:111)</div>

  b. *Su dottore m'at   nadu   a no papai   tropu   drucis   tui.*

    the doctor to.me=has said   to not eat.INF too.many   sweets   you.SG

    'The doctor told me that you should not eat too many sweets.'

<div align="right">(Campidanese Srd., Virdis 2015:466)</div>

3.1.1   Subject positions

There is variation across Romance with respect to the relative position of the verb and its subject. A frequent pattern is the one of the postverbal subject, as is the case in southern Italian dialects (Ledgeway 2000:126), in Sardinian (Jones 1992; Jones 1993:168), in Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994:89; Pană Dindelegan 2013a:218), and in peninsular Spanish (Torrego 1998:207; Hernanz 1999:2211; Ledgeway 2000:126; Zagona 2002:28; Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:2002):

(9) *Me   faceva   muri'.. invece 'e   (*essa)   muri'   essa!*

   me   make.IPFV.3SG die.INF .. instead of   she   die.INF   she!

   'She made me die instead of dying herself!'

<div align="right">(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:126)</div>

Other varieties, including some Caribbean and Latin American varieties, as well as Sicilian, however, allow preverbal subjects (Ledgeway 2000:128; Zagona 2002:71–2), as in the following examples:

(10) a. *Antes   de yo salir   de mi país*, …

    before   of I   leave.INF of my country

    'before I leave my country'

<div align="right">(Colombian Sp., Lipski 1994: 215, *apud* Zagona 2002:62)</div>

  b. *Chi ci vurrissi   pi io nèsciri   di ccà?*

    what LOC=want.COND.3SG   for I go.out.INF   of here

    'What would be necessary for me to escape from here?'

<div align="right">(Sic., Bentley 2014:112)</div>

In both languages, the preverbal position is restricted to kinship terms and pronominal subjects, i.e. heads (Xs). Lexical (XP) subjects appear obligatorily postverbally. There is no difference in interpretation between the two positions (Ledgeway 2000:126–127). Pronominal subjects do not occupy a left-peripheral position, as they are incompatible with a topicalised or focused reading; furthermore, foci and topics precede the complementiser (Ledgeway 2000:139–40). Therefore, in case of a preverbal subject, the infinitive does not occupy a position within the C-domain.

In peninsular Spanish, the subject can only appear preverbally when it is narrowly focused, as in the following example:

(11) *Al   el juez   leer   el verdicto, todo el mundo   se levantó.*
     at.the the judge   read.INF the verdict, all   the world   REFL=stand.up.PRET.3SG
     'When the judge read the verdict, everyone stood up.'

                                                   (Sp., Torrego 1998:n. 3)

This position is highly restricted; the unmarked subject position is the postverbal one. The Catalan personal infinitive patterns slightly differently from the two groups discussed above. When expressed, the subject occurs postposed to the verb in infinitival subject clauses:

(12) *(*Nosaltres)   cantar   ara   nosaltres   no   seria   mala idea.*
     we   sing.INF now   we   NEG   be.COND.3SG   bad   idea
     'It would not be a bad idea for us to sing.'

                                                   (Cat., Hualde 1992:39)

Subject infinitivals therefore pattern as in peninsular Spanish, SIDs and Romanian. In prepositional adjuncts, the preverbal position is allowed, at least for some speakers (Mensching 2000:35; Hualde 1992:38). According to Rigau (1995:282) and Wheeler et al. (1999:399), on the other hand, the subject always has to be postverbal in Catalan. There is thus interspeaker variation. All examples in the literature of preverbal subjects contain pronominals, which suggests that Catalan adverbial infinitivals pattern like LA Spanish and Sicilian:

(13) *Abans de (%tu)   sortir   tu,   va   arribar   en Joan.*
     before of you.SG   go.out.INF you.SG,   go.3SG   arrive.INF   the Joan
     'Before you went out, Joan arrived.'

                                                         (Cat.)

The postverbal subject could be an indication of high verb movement across the position of the subject. However, we have to exclude that the subject has remained in situ. This will become clear in the following section where both the infinitive and the subject precede adverbs from the LAS.

3.1.2 Adverbs

Testing verb movement with adverbs, we can conclude that the infinitive occupies a high position. As shown in the following selection of examples, the personal infinitives have to precede adverbs from the LAS:

(14) a. *Mamma cucina   assaiə pe magnà   sempə (*magnà)   tutti   quanti   bbuonə.*
     mother   cook.3SG a.lot for eat.INF always eat.INF   all   how.many well
     'Mother cooks a lot so that everyone always eats well.'

   b. *Prima e' (*ancorə) succerə   chestə   ancorə, stevə   al telefənə.*
     before of again   happen.INF this   again, stay.IPFV.1SG at.the phone
     'Before this happened again, I was on the phone.'

   c. *Convene   'e (*sempə) ce parlà   tu   sempə.*
     be.better.3SG of always   to.him=speak.INF you.SG   always
     'It is better if you always speak to him.'

                                                               (SIDs, Moiano (BN))

(15) a. *At   segadu   sos pratos pro non manigare pius   (*manigare)   tue.*
     have.3SG broken   the plates for   NEG eat.INF   anymore eat.INF   you.NOM
     'S/he has broken the plates so you do not eat anymore.'
                                                               (Srd., Mensching 2000:123)

   b. *Maria cheriat   a mandigare   sempre (*mandigare) bene (*mandigare) sos*
     Maria want.COND.3SG to eat.INF   always eat.INF   well eat.INF   the
     pizzinnos.
     boys
     'Maria wanted the boys to always eat well.'
                                                               (NU, Srd.)

In all languages studied, the personal infinitive moves out of the LAS. Most postverbal subjects precede these adverbs as well, indicating that they too can move out of the VP. However, this is not the case in Sardinian (cf. (15b)) and it is not obligatory in Spanish or the SIDs.

For the HAS adverbs, there is a clear tendency across all languages studied: speakers prefer the infinitive to precede high adverbs. Although in most cases of HAS adverbs the infinitive can also marginally follow the adverb, this is not the unmarked order:

(16) a. *Para llegar   manaña   (llegar)   Pedro, el tren   debe   salir   a tiempo.*
     for   arrive.INF tomorrow arrive.INF   Pedro, the train   must.3SG leave.INF in time
     'For Pedro to arrive tomorrow, the train has to leave on time.'

  b. *De tomar   generalmente (*tomar) Juan dos vasos   con la   cena,   ciertamente*
     of take.INF   generally   take.INF Juan two glasses   with the dinner   certainly
     engordará.
     gain.weight.FUT.3SG
     'If Juan generally takes two glasses with dinner, he will certainly gain weight.'

  c. ?*Sin   saberlo   yo francamente (*saberlo), mi marido   vendió   mi casa.*
     without   know.INF=it I   frankly   know.INF=it my husband   sell.PRET.3SG my house
     'Without me knowing it frankly, my husband sold my house.'

  d. ?*Se casaron   justo al   acabar   afortunadamente (*acabar) la guerra.*
     REFL=marry.PRET.3PL just   at.the end.INF   fortunately   end.INF   the war
     'They got married just when the war fortunately ended.'

                                                      (Sp.)

(17) a. *Es van   casar   en desafortunadament   començar (*desafortunadament) la*
     REFL=go.3PL marry.INF   in unfortunately   start.INF   unfortunately   the
     guerra.
     war
     'They married as the war unfortunately started.'

  b. *Abans   de (#perdre) potser perdre   tu   la feina, hauríem   de vendre   la*
     before   of lose.INF   maybe lose.INF   you.SG the job   have.COND.1PL of sell.INF   the
     casa.
     house
     'Before you maybe lose your job, we should sell the house.'

  c. *Insultar   el Jordi expressament (#insultar)   la seva mare,   va   ser   terrible.*
     insult.INF   the Jordi on.purpose   insult.INF   the his mother go.3SG   be.INF terrible
     'Jordi insulting his mother on purpose has been terrible.'

                                                      (Cat.)

The normal position for an adverb from the HAS is thus to follow the personal infinitive. Personal infinitives thus seem to move to a high position, possibly in the C-domain. This high position also explains the obligatory postverbal position of the subject.

3.1.3 Left-peripheral elements

Pragmatically marked constituents such as topics and foci generally precede both the infinitive and the nominative subject:

(18) *Al   el juez   leer   el verdicto, todo el mundo   se levantó.*
at.the the judge   read.INF the verdict, all   the world   REFL=stand.up.PRET.3SG
'When the judge read the verdict, everyone stood up.'

(Sp., Torrego 1998:n. 3)

(19) a. *Io capisco   so'   femmene, e li femmene   pe fà   toletta,   nce*
I understand.1SG   be.3PL   women and the women   for make.INF toilet   LOC=
vò   la mano   de lo   Cielo.
want.3SG   the hand   of the heaven
'I know they are woman, and for women to get ready requires divine intervention.'
   b. *E   tu   pe t'ascì   na parola   da la vocca   nce vonno   de spuntanate.*
and   you.SG   for you=go.out.INF a word   of the mouth   LOC=want.3PL of urging
'And you, to get a word out of your mouth, it takes some encouragement.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:140)

(20) *(Această carte,)   înainte de (*această carte) a o citi   eu, trebuie*
this book   before of   this book   to it=read.INF   I,   be.necessary.3SG
s-o termine   de citit   Ana.
SA it=finish.SBVJ.3SG   of read.SUP   Ana
'This book, before I read it, it is necessary that Ana finishes reading it.'

(Ro.)

This indicates that the infinitive is not in Force, but is instead located in a high position within the HAS or in Fin.

As noted by Ledgeway (2000:136), personal infinitives cannot be combined with complementisers such as the interrogative *se*. This does not however mean that they compete for the same position (viz. Force), as most of the personal infinitives are preceded by a non-finite

complementiser such as AD or DE, which in Italian arguably lexicalises Fin (cf. Rizzi 1997), and the verb is thus located lower than both Fin and Force, viz. in the I-domain. In Spanish and Catalan, personal infinitives are often preceded by the prepositions *al* or *en*. However, as seen in (18), these precede the focus phrase and are thus located higher than Fin.

3.1.4 Clitic placement

Clitics appear in proclisis in Romanian, Sardinian and Neapolitan personal infinitives,[6] suggesting that the infinitive is located lower than the clitic:

(21) *Ion se teme   a nu-l   apuca   iarna   cu   casa   neterminată.*
     Ion REFL=fear.3SG to not=him overtake.INF winter.DET with house.DET unfinished
     'Ion is afraid of winter overtaking him with the house unfinished. '

(Ro., Pană Dindelegan 2013a:216)

(22) *Bisonzat   a l'ochìere   tue.*
     be.necessary.3SG   to him=kill.INF you.SG
     'It is necessary that you kill him.'

(Log. Srd., Ledgeway 2016b:1018)

This does not differentiate the infinitives from the finite verbs. In Catalan and Spanish, on the other hand, the clitic appears in enclisis:

(23) *Rentar-se   ell la roba   era   l'únic   que   podia   fer.*
     wash.INF=REFL he the clothes be.IPFV.3SG the only that   can IPFV.3SG do.INF
     'Doing the laundry himself was the only option.'

(Cat., Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:399)

In these varieties, we see that although personal infinitives have in common with finite verb forms that they license nominative subjects, they nevertheless do not show the same finiteness effects with clitics. If enclitics indeed indicate high verb-movement, the conclusion is that personal infinitives move higher than finite forms (cf. Schifano 2018, who argues that Catalan and Spanish are low V-movement languages, except in the subjunctive). It is however not likely that the difference in cliticisation between the different languages studied here indicates a difference in verb movement, given the similar results in preceding sections.

---

[6] In Neapolitan, both enclisis and proclisis are attested with infinitives (Ledgeway 2009a:333).

3.1.5   Conclusion

The following table summarises the results of this subsection:

Table 4.2 Movement of personal infinitive in Romance

Language	Movement
Spanish	HAS (across 'generally' $Asp_{habitual}$)
Catalan	HAS (across 'on purpose' $Mod_{volitional}$ and 'fortunately' $Mood_{eval}$, not across 'maybe' $Mood_{irr}$)
SIDs	HAS (across 'tomorrow' T)
Sardinian	HAS (across always $Asp_{perfect}$)
Romanian	HAS (across maybe $Mood_{irr}$, fortunately $Mood_{eval}$)

The various Romance languages under examination pattern remarkably similarly in that the personal infinitive occupies a high position within the inflectional domain. It precedes all the LAS adverbs and can precede most HAS adverbs. The infinitive follows constituents located in the C-domain.

3.2 Inflected infinitives

Some Romance languages present inflected infinitives which agree with their subject in both person and number, as can be seen in the European Portuguese example cited in (24):

(24)   *Será   difícil   **eles** aprovar**em**   a proposta.*
       be.FUT.3SG   difficult   they   approve.INF.3.PL   the proposal
       'It will be difficult for them to accept the proposal.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:86)

Other Romance languages that present inflected infinitives include Brazilian Portuguese, Galician, old Leonese, old Neapolitan, and the Logudorese and Nuorese varieties of Sardinian.[7] In all these languages, the inflected infinitive consists, at least, of the regular infinitive to which inflectional endings are added. The inflected infinitive is not marked for tense or mood; it can be marked for aspect analytically, by combining the inflected infinitive of an auxiliary with a past participle. The

---

[7] Cf., among many others, Maurer (1968) Gondar (1978), Loporcaro (1986), Jones (1992; 1993; 1997), Pountain (1995), Vincent (1996; 1998), Ledgeway (1998; 2007; 2009a:920–32; 2012a:293–4; 2016b:1016–8), Mensching (2000), Sitaridou (2002), Scida (2004), Pires (2002; 2006), Sheehan, Blokzijl & Parafita Couto (to appear).

paradigm of the inflected infinitive is given for all six languages in Table 4.3 (cf. (Ledgeway 2012a:293; 2016b:1017):

Table 4.3 Inflected infinitive in Romance

	EuPt.	BrPt.	Gal.	Old Leonese	Srd.	ONap.
1SG	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*kantáre-**po***	*cantar(e)-**Ø***
2SG	*cantar-**es***		*cantar-**es***	*cantar-**es***	*kantáre-**s***	*cantar(e)-**Ø***
3SG	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*cantar-**Ø***	*kantáre-**t***	*cantar(e)-**Ø***
1PL	*cantar-**mos***	*cantar-**mos***	*cantar-**mos***	*cantar-**mos***	*kantáre-**mus***	*cantar(e)-**mo***
2PL	*cantar-**des***		*cantar-**des***	*cantar-**des***	*kantáre-**zis***	*cantar(e)-**vo/ve***
3PL	*cantar-**em***	*cantar-**em***	*cantar-**en***	*cantar-**en***	*kantáre-**n***	*cantar(e)-**no***

As can be seen in Table 4.3, the languages vary with respect to the number of persons that have a designated ending. Whereas only Sardinian presents different endings for all six persons, old Neapolitan only has inflection for the plural. Brazilian Portuguese has the same endings as European Portuguese but has lost the second person endings across the whole verbal paradigm (Dubert & Galves 2016:426), leading to four forms of the inflected infinitive. In all languages, the inflected infinitive is always regular: the forms are the same for all verb classes, including irregular verbs.

The inflected infinitive can appear in a variety of contexts in all languages. It is found mostly in embedded clauses,[8] which can never be introduced by a finite complementiser (25):

(25) **Será   difícil   que   os deputados aprovarem   a   proposta.*
      be.FUT.3SG difficult that   the deputies approve.INF.3.PL the   proposal
      'It will be difficult for them to accept the proposal.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:86)

Inflected infinitives are found in subject clauses, in various types of complement clauses (with Galician being relatively restrictive with respect to the types of complements) and in clausal adjuncts. European Portuguese and old Neapolitan also allow inflected infinitives in combination with causative and perception verbs whenever the embedded subject intervenes. Impossible contexts in all languages are raising verbs with a raised subject, modal verbs and contexts of exhaustive local subject control.

---

[8] In Portuguese and Galician, the inflected infinitive can also be found in main clauses, more specifically in root exclamatives (Álvarez Blanco, Monteagudo & Regueira 1986:386–7; Madeira 1994)

3.2.1   Subject positions

There are various diagnostics that can be used to establish the height of verb-movement of inflected infinitives. A first indication is provided by the relative position of the verb and the subject. The subject is postverbal in Sardinian (26). In Portuguese (27), it is usually preverbal.[9] However, inversion is also allowed with auxiliaries in Portuguese (27b) (Ambar 1994; Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017):

(26) *Non   keljo   a (*tue) cantares   (tue).*
       not   want.1SG   to you.SG sing.INF.2.SG you.SG
       'I do not want you to sing.'

                                                        (Srd., Jones 1992:297)

(27) a. *Lamento   eles   perderem   *(eles)   os documentos.*
           regret.1SG   they   lose.INF.3.PL   they   the   documents
           'I regret that they lose the documents.'

                                                        (EuPt., Madeira 1994:183)

      b. *Lamento (eles) terem   (eles) perdido os documentos.*
           regret.1SG   they   have.INF.3.PL   they lost   the documents
           'I regret that they have lost the documents.'

                                                        (EuPt., Madeira 1994:183)

In Sardinian the subject occupies a relatively low, or right-dislocated position, as the most natural word order is VOS, rather than VSO (Groothuis 2019). The subject position will therefore not be very informative about the position of the verb within the IP.

The Galician inflected infinitive allows both orders in adjuncts (28a), but permits only postverbal subjects in complements to declaratives and in subject clauses (28b):

(28) a. *Para (ti)   ires   (ti)   ó partido*,
           for   you.SG   go.INF.2.SG you.SG   to.the game
           'For you to go to the game, …'

                                                        (Gal., Parafita Couto 2002:46–7)

      b. *Será   difícil   (*eles) aprobaren   eles a proposta.*
           be.FUT.3SG   difficult they   approve.INF.3.PL   they the proposal

---

[9] The Portuguese inflected infinitive is also found with obligatory subject-verb inversion in declarative and epistemic complements, see §3.4.

'It will be difficult that they approve the proposal.'

<div align="right">(Gal., Sheehan & Parafita Couto 2011: 2)</div>

It can easily be shown that when appearing postverbally, the subject has also left its base position:

(29) *Para iren   os nenos todos ó partido*, ...
    for   go.INF.3.PL the boys all   to.the game
    'For the boys all go to the game, ...'

<div align="right">(Gal.)</div>

The grammaticality of the floating quantifier *todos* 'all' following the subject shows that the subject has moved out of the VP in Galician inflected infinitival clauses. This means that the verb has also left the VP.

In old Neapolitan, both subject orders are allowed, as is illustrated by the following almost minimal pair:

(30) a. *per   tanto pizola accaysune quanto fo   quella   de li Grieici   essereno*
       for   such small occasion   as   be.PST.3SG that   of the Greeks be.INF.3.PL
      licenciate.
      dismissed
      'for such a small cause as was the one of the Greeks being sent away.'

<div align="right">(ONap., LDT 75.10-11, *apud* Ledgeway 2007:927)</div>

    b. *per   tanto pizola accaysune, quale fo   chesta de esserenno licenciati*
      for   such small occasion   which be.PST.3SG that   of be.INF.3.PL dismissed
      li Greci
      the Greeks
      'for such a small cause, which was this of the Greeks being sent away'

<div align="right">(ONap., LDT 53.14-15, *apud* Ledgeway 2007:927)</div>

This difference in word order can be explained by movement of either the verb or the subject, or both. Due to a lack of data with floating quantifiers we cannot definitely exclude one or the other option.

3.2.2 Adverbs

A second diagnostic is provided by the position of adverbs with respect to the inflected infinitive. Adverbs of the LAS have to follow inflected infinitives:

(31) a. *É   preciso   eles beberem   frequentemente (*beberem)   água.*
        be.3SG   necessary   they drink.INF.3.PL frequently   drink.INF.3.PL   water

        'It is necessary that they frequently drink water.'

   b. *?É   pena eles perderem   já   (*perderem) o emprego.*
        be.3SG   pity   they lose.INF.3.PL already   lose.INF.3.PL the job

        'It is a pity that they already lose their job.'

   c. *É   preciso   nós fazermos   bem (*fazermos) os exercícios.*
        be.3SG   necessary   we do.INF.1.PL well   do.INF.1.PL the exercises

        'It is necessary for us to do the exercises well.'

                                                                                         (EuPt.)

(32) a. *Appo   fattu cussu po essereis   torra (*essereis)   cuntentos.*
        have.1SG done this   for be.INF.2.PL again be.INF.2.PL   happy

        'I have done this for you to be happy again.'

   b. *Mariu at   cunzau   sa ventana pro no   intenderet prus (*intenderet)   fritu.*
        Mariu have.3SG   closed   the window for NEG   feel.INF.3.SG anymore feel.INF.3.SG cold

        'Mariu has closed the window in order not to feel cold anymore.'

   c. *Maria cheriat   a   mandigaren sempre (*mandigaren) bene (*mandigaren)   sos*
        Maria want.COND.3SG to eat.INF.3.PL always   eat.INF.3.PL   well eat.INF.3.PL   the
        pizzinnos.
        boys.

        'Maria wants the boys to always eat well.'

   d. *Non   credo   de esseret   dza   (*esseret)   ghiratu Juanne.*
        NEG   believe.1SG of be.INF.3.SG already   be.INF.3.SG returned Juanne

        'I don't think Juanne has already returned.'

                                                                                         (NU, Srd.)

   The following examples show that movement into the HAS is not obligatory, as speakers of European Portuguese and Galician allow adverbs from the HAS both to precede and follow the infinitive, although the preferred option is the infinitive preceding the adverb.

(33) *É   pena eles perderem   provavelmente (*?perderem)   o emprego.*
     be.3SG   pity they lose.INF.3.PL   probably   lose.INF.3.PL   the job

     'It is a pity that they probably lose their job.'

                                                                                         (EuPt.)

(34) *Nós   lamentamos   eles   francamente   /evidentemente /necessariamente*
we   regret.1PL   they   frankly   /evidently   /necessarily
terem   francamente /evidentemente
have.INF.3.PL   frankly   evidently
/necessariamente   recebido pouco   dinheiro.
necessarily   received little   money
'We reget that they have frankly/evidently/necessarily/fortunately received little money.'

(EuPt., Groothuis 2015:85)

(35) a. *Os meninos lamentam (terem)   os deputados   cautelosamente   (terem)*
the boys   regret.3PL have.INF.3.PL the deputies   cautiously   have.INF.3.PL
votado   a   proposta.
voted   the proposal
b. *Os meninos lamentam terem   cautelosamente   os deputados (*terem)*
the boys   regret.3PL have.INF.3.PL cautiously   the deputies have.inf.3.pl
votado   a   proposta.
voted   the proposal
'The boys regret that the deputies have cautiously voted for the proposal.'

(EuPt., Costa 2004:138)

In Sardinian, the infinitive necessarily has to precede the adverb *como* 'now':

(36) *Mannedda   cheriat   a mandigaremus   como (*mandigaremus).*
grandmother   want.IPFV.3SG   to eat.INF.1.PL   now   eat.INF.1.PL
'Grandmother would like us to eat now.'

(Srd.)

Indeed, Costa (2004:138) argues on the basis of the examples in (35) that I-to-C movement is not obligatory in EuPt., because the verb can follow both the adverb and the subject. Given the impossibility of topicalisation (see below), the preverbal subject cannot be in a topicalised position and thus the verb, when appearing to the right of the subject, cannot be in the CP either. This set of examples also shows that a certain degree of verb movement is obligatory, as the inflected infinitive cannot appear after the lower subject position (indicated by the fact that the subject follows the adverb *cautelosamente*). This high position of the inflected infinitive is very different from the generally low position of the finite verb (Schifano 2018:134). It makes the

inflected infinitive more similar to the subjunctive (Schifano 2018:228), with which it is in competition.

Many higher adverbs prove unacceptable in inflected infinitival clauses, both in Galician and in Sardinian:

(37) a. ***É moi feo (aprobaren) eles desagraciadamente (aprobaren) a proposta.*
  be.3SG very bad approve.INF.3.PL they unfortunately approve.INF.3.PL the proposal
  'It is very bad that they unfortunately approved the proposal.'

 b. **É moi feo (perderen) eles probablemente (perderen) o traballo.*
  be.3SG very bad lose.INF.3.PL they probably lose.INF.3.PL the work
  'It is very bad for them to probably lose their job.'

 c. **É moi feo non responderes xeralmente (responderes).*
  be.3SG very bad NEG answer.INF.2.SG generally answer.INF.2.SG
  'It is very bad for you to not answer generally.'

                    (Gal.)

(38) a. *%Maria at fattu cussu pro (comprenderemus) fortzis (comprenderemus)*
  Maria have.3SG done this for understand.INF.1.PL maybe understand.INF.1.PL
  sos problemas suos.
  the problems her
  'Maria has done this so that we would maybe understand her problems.'

 b. *%Maridu meu at bendutu tottu pro comporaremus tzertu comporaremus*
  husband mine have.3SG sold all for buy.INF.1.PL certainly buy.inf.1.pl
  sa domu.
  the house
  'My husband has sold everything so that we would certainly buy the house.'

                    (Srd.)

As will be discussed below, this could be due to the absence of direct anchoring: high adverbs might be difficult in general to use in embedded contexts which lack a direct anchoring point as speakers prefer to have them taking scope over the whole (finite main) sentence, which is directly anchored.

There is an almost complete lack of adverb data for the old Neapolitan inflected infinitive. In the database of the *Opera del vocabolairo italiano*, various examples (n=71) can be found of

inflected infinitives by searching the endings of the inflected infinitive. [10] There are two occurrences of adverbs in these examples:

(39) a. *Se ve placesse*   *de trasirevo*   *mo'*   *a la vattaglya, …*
   if to.you.PL=pleased.SBJV.3SG   of enter.INF.2.PL   now   to the battle
   'If you would like to enter the battle now'

<div align="right">(ONap., Dest. De Troya, 25 p. 214, r.17)</div>

    b. *Li quali*   *sì se proferzeno*   *de incontinente se apprestareno*   *a venire.*
   the which   thus REFL=offer.PST.3PL   of immediately REFL=hurry.INF.3PL   to come.INF
   'who offered to immediately hurry there.'

<div align="right">(ONap., Dest. De Troya, 4 p. 68, r. 20)</div>

These examples show that the infinitive can raise across T (*mo'* 'now' can be analysed as a T-related adverb). On the other hand, the infinitive can also stay lower than *incontinente* 'immediately'. The data are too few to draw any strong conclusions, but it seems that there is an optional movement into the HAS in old Neapolitan inflected infinitives.

3.2.3   Left-peripheral elements

Third, we can test the relative order of the infinitive and elements in the left-periphery. Topicalisation is impossible both in factive and epistemic/declarative contexts in European Portuguese:

(40) a. **Eu*   *lamento,*   *esse livro,*   *terem*   *eles lido*.
   I   regret.1SG   this book   have.INF.3.PL   they read
    b. **Eu*   *lamento*   *terem,*   *esse livro,*   *eles lido.*
   I   regret.1SG   have.INF.3.PL   this book   they read
   'This book, I regret they read it.'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Costa 2004:137)</div>

In Galician subject clauses, the inflected infinitive can follow and precede left-peripheral phrases such as topics (41) and contrastive foci (42):

(41) a. *Convén*   *facermos*   *todas as cousas.*
   be.better.3SG   do.INF.1.PL   all   the things

---

[10] The strings searched for were: **rmo, *remo, *rme, *reme, *rvo, *revo, *rve, *reve, *rno, *reno, *rene, *rne.*

'It is better for us to do all the things.'

b. *Convén,   as cousas,   facermol-as   todas.*
be.better.3SG   the things   do.INF.1.PL=them all

c. *Convén,   facermol-as   cousas   todas.*
be.better.3SG   do.INF.1.PL=the   things   all
'The things, it is better if we do them all.'

(42) a. *Convén,   HOXE facermo-las   cousas,   non mañá.*
be.better.3SG   today do.INF.1.PL=the things   NEG tomorrow

b. *Convén,   facermos   HOXE   as cousas,   non mañá.*
be.better.3SG   do.INF.1.PL   today the things   NEG tomorrow
'It is better to do the things today, not tomorrow.'

These topics and focused elements could indicate that there is optional movement of the inflected infinitive into the CP. However, it is more likely that the foci and topics instead can move to both the lower and the higher left periphery while the verb occupies the same position in both cases. This latter option will be assumed as the adverbs indicate a high placement of the infinitive.

Inflected infinitives in European Portuguese and Galician are generally not preceded by the (non-finite) complementisers, unlike their Old Neapolitan or Sardinian counterparts, which are always introduced by *a* or *de* when occurring in argumental position. Assuming that these lexicalise Fin, we can conclude that the Old Neapolitan and Sardinian inflected infinitives are therefore necessarily located within the IP.

3.2.4   Clitic placement

Finally, clitic placement might be indicative of the position of the verb. In European Portuguese, inflected infinitives show a different pattern of clitic placement from bare infinitives (Raposo & Uriagereka 2005). For instance, in adjuncts that are introduced by a preposition, the clitic can appear in proclisis and enclisis when the verb is a bare infinitive, but has to be proclitic in the case of an inflected infinitive (43):

(43) *Para a vermos(*-la)   outra vez,   faríamos   tudo.*
for   her=see.INF.1.PL(=her)   another time   do.COND.1PL all
'In order for us to see her one more time, we would do everything.'

(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 683)

Enclisis is the only possibility in subject infinitival clauses (44):

(44) (**Te*) *convidarmos-te*   *para a festa*   *seria*   *uma boa ideia.*
      (you=) invite.INF.1.PL=you   for the party   be.COND.3SG a   good idea
      'To invite you to the party would be a good idea.'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 684)</div>

However, enclisis is not allowed when an operator such as focus or negation is present in the clause. In that case, only proclisis is allowed, just as in finite clauses:

(45) *Não te*   *convidarmos(-*te)*   *para* *a festa*   *seria*   *uma boa ideia.*
      NEG you=invite.INF.1.PL=you   for   the party   be.COND.3SG a   good idea
      'Not to invite you to the party would be a good idea.'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 685)</div>

It thus seems that negation and focalisation interfere with the verb movement.

Galician clitic placement generally follows the Portuguese pattern (Roberts 2016:795), but the clitic shows more mobility than in European Portuguese (Longa 1994). The canonical position for the clitic with inflected infinitives is in enclisis:

(46) *Convén,*   *as cousas,* *facermol-as*   *todas.*
      be.better.3SG   the things   do.INF.1.PL=them all
      'It is better if we do all the things.'

<div align="right">(Gal.)</div>

In Sardinian, in contrast, the clitic always appears in proclisis:

(47) *Non* *keljo*   *a* *bi vénneres*   *tue.*
      NEG   want.1SG   to LOC=come.INF.2.SG you.SG
      'I don't want you to come.'

<div align="right">(Srd., Jones 1993:279)</div>

In old Neapolitan, clitics both precede and follow the infinitive (Vincent 1998; Ledgeway 2009a:920ff.):

(48) a. *Macenate ordenò*   *mangiarnose*   *li pullitri de queste.*

Macenate order.PRET.3SG   eat.INF.3PL=REFL   the foals of these

'Macenate ordered that their foals would be eaten.'

b. *Lo signor comandò   queste cose se dareno   ad te   et non   ad altro.*

the lord order.PRET.3SG these things REFL=give.INF.3.PL to you.SG   and not to other

'The lord ordered that these things should be given to you and not to others.'

(ONap., Ledgeway 2009a:923–4)

This supports the conclusion that movement within the IP was optional with inflected infinitives in Old Neapolitan.

3.2.5   Conclusion

Table 4.4 Movement of inflected infinitive in Romance

Language	V-Movement
EP	HAS/Fin across 'probably' Mod$_{epistemic}$
Galician	HAS across 'now' T, optional across 'maybe' Mood$_{irrealis}$
Sardinian	HAS across 'now' T
Old Neapolitan	optional movement in HAS across 'now' T

Within the inflected infinitives, a general pattern of high verb movement can be noted. In European Portuguese, adverbs indicate a possible high movement in all cases, where the infinitive can precede all adverbs. Clitic placement seems to confirm the high movement as enclisis is the only option in subject clauses and complements to epistemic and declarative verbs. However, this high movement is blocked in the presence of foci or negation, even though the subject still appears postverbally.

Also in Galician, the infinitive moves into the HAS, which is confirmed by the prevailing enclisis, the tendency to have adverbs follow the infinitive, and the postverbal subject in subject clauses. Finally, in Sardinian and Neapolitan, the infinitive can move up into the HAS as well. The movement of the old Neapolitan inflected infinitive seems to have an optional character, as both subjects and HAS can both precede and follow the infinitive. It should be noted however that our conclusion on the movement of the old Neapolitan inflected infinitive is limited by the nature of textual examples, which do not allow us to robustly test all the variables involved.

3.3 Infinitival clauses

3.3.1   Adverbs

The infinitive in subject clauses seems to raise quite high in most Romance languages. The infinitive moves out of the LAS, as it has to precede LAS adverbs across Romance; see the representative examples from European Portuguese (49), NIDs (50), and Sardinian (51):

(49) a. *Treinar   regularmente (*treinar) parece   uma boa   ideia.*
        train.INF   regularly   train.INF seem.3SG   a   good idea
        'It seems a good idea to train regularly.'

    b. *Precisa   de trabalhar   bem (*trabalhar) para obter   uma promoção.*
        be.necessary.3SG of work.INF   well work.INF   for   obtain.INF a   promotion
        'It is necessary to work well to obtain a promotion.'

    c. *É   impossível estar   sempre acordado sem   café.*
        be.3SG   impossible stay.INF always awake   without coffee
        'It is impossible to always stay awake without coffee.'

                                                   (EuPt.)

(50) a. *Ndar   già   (?ndar)   a casa saria   un pecà.*
        go.INF   already go.INF   to home be.COND.3SG a   sin
        'To go home already would be a pity.'

    b. *Magnar ben (*magnar) xe   fondamental.*
        eat.INF   well eat.INF   be.3SG   fundamental
        'Eating well is fundamental.'

    c. *Xe   imposibile restar   sempre (?*restar) svegi   sensa   un cafè.*
        be.3SG   impossible stay.INF always   stay.INF awake   without a coffee
        'It is impossible to always stay awake without a coffee.'

    d. *Non   magnar pi   (*magnar) ciocolato   saria   masa dificil   par mi.*
        not   eat.INF anymore eat.INF   chocolate   be.COND.3SG too   difficult for me
        'Not eating chocolate anymore would be too difficult for me.'

                                                  (Ven.)

(51) a. *A andare   in palestra medas vortas   achet   bene.*
        to go.INF   in gym   many times   do.3SG   well
        'Going often to the gym is good for you.''

    b. *Est   meda importante a manicare bene (*manicare).*

be.3SG   very important to eat.INF   well eat.INF

   'It is very important to eat well.'

c. *Diat   èssere troppu difitzile, pro mene,   a non bi manicare pius (*manicare)*

   AUX.COND be.INF too   difficult for me   to not LOC=eat.INF anymore eat.INF

   cicculatte.

   chocolate

   'It would be too difficult for me to not eat chocolate anymore.'

                                      (Srd., Orani (NU))

With HAS adverbs, there is more variation across varieties. However, a strong tendency to place the adverbs after the infinitive can be discerned:

(52) a. *Perder   probabilmente (*perder) el lavoro xe   na bruta situassion.*

     lose.INF probably   lose.INF the work be.3SG   a ugly   situation

     'To probably lose one's job is an ugly situation.'

b. *Trovar fortunatamente (*trovar) dei amissi   lo ga   giutà.*

     find.INF fortunately   find.INF of.the friends   him=have.3SG helped

     'Finding fortunately some friends has helped him.'

c. *(Ndar) necessariamente (ndar) ogni di   a lavorar   xe   masa.*

     go.INF   necessarily   go.INF   every day to work.INF be.3SG   too.much

     'Going necessarily everyday to work is too much.'

                                        (Ven.)

(53) a. *(*A sse truvà)   pe ffortuna a sse truvà   cacchə amicə a   aiutatə.*

     to REFL=find.INF   for fortune to REFL=find.INF   some friend   have.3SG helped

     'Finding fortunately some friends has helped.'

b. *A jjì   pe fforzə (a jjì)   a ffaticà   ognə juornə è   ttroppə.*

     to go.INF for force to go.INF to work.INF every day   be.3SG   too.much

     'Going necessarily to work every day is too much.'

c. *A pperde   forsə   a faticə è   na bbrutta situazionə.*

     to lose.INF maybe   the work be.3SG   a ugly   situation

     'To maybe lose one's job is an ugly situation.'

                                    (SIDs, Moiano (BN))

(54) a. *Làstima   a ghirare   como.*

     be.pity.3SG to go.back.INF now

'It is a pity to go back now.'

b. *A pèrdere vortzis su tribagliu est leggiu meda.*
   to lose.INF maybe the work be.3SG ugly very
   'To maybe lose one's job is very ugly.'

c. *A accattare amicos pro vortuna (*accattare) l'at azudau a s'ambientare.*
   to find.INF friends for luck find.INF him=have.3SG helped to REFL=settle.in.INF
   'Finding fortunately some friends has helped him to settle in.'

d. *A andare per fortza (*andare) cada die a tribagliare est troppu.*
   to go.INF for force go.INF every day to work.INF be.3SG too.much
   'Going to work necessarily everyday is too much.'

(Srd., Orani (NU))

For infinitival adjuncts, we have a similar picture, as can be seen in the following Italian examples:

(55) a. *Siamo andati al paese per visitare di nuovo (*visitare) il museo.*
   be.1PL gone to.the village for visit.INF of new visit.INF the museum
   'We went to the village to visit the museum again.'

   b. *La ragazza si veste bene per (essere) forse (*essere) notata dal ragazzo.*
   the girl REFL=dress.3SG well for be.INF maybe be.INF noticed by.the boy
   'The girl dresses well in order to maybe be noticed by the boy.'

   c. *Ho pagato la cena a tutti senza (avere) francamente (avere)*
   have.1SG paid the dinner to all without have.INF frankly have.INF
   abbastanza soldi.
   enough money
   'I have paid the dinner for everyone without frankly having enough money.'

   d. *Per (rispondere) bene (*rispondere) alla domanda, ho controllato la data.*
   for answer.INF well answer.INF at.the question, have.1SG checked the date
   'In order to answer the question well, I have checked the date.'

(It.)

In infinitival adjuncts, the infinitive also needs to precede the adverbs. In conclusion, then, the infinitive in most Romance languages, in both subject clauses and infinitival adjuncts, raises to a very high position.

At first glance, the situation seems different for French infinitives. As discussed in the literature (cf. Pollock 1989; Schifano 2018:244–46, a.o.), French infinitives show optional movement with LAS adverbs:

(56) a. *(*manger)*   *déjà*   *(manger)*   *le gâteau serait*   *un insulte à Silvie* (BFr.)

       eat.INF   already   eat.INF   the cake   be.COND.3SG an insult to Silvie

       'Eating the cake already would be an insult to Silvie.'

    b. *(Connaître) déjà*   *(connaitre) les questions*   *serait*   *un avantage.* (Fr.)

       know.INF   already   know.INF   the questions   be.COND.3SG   an advantage

       'Knowing already the questions would be an advantage.'

    c. *(Sortir)*   *toujours (sortir)*   *le samedi*   *soir*   *est*   *habituel chez les jeunes.*

       go.out.INF   always   go.out.INF   the Saturday   evening   be.3SG normal at   the young

       'Always going out on Saturday night is normal for young people.'

    d. *(Travailler) bien* *(travailler)* *est*   *très important.*

       work.INF   well   work.INF   be.3SG   very important

       'To work well is very important.'

                                                        (Fr., Schifano 2015:82–3)

Verb movement in French thus seems optional. The infinitive can raise over any of the LAS adverbs, but does not always do so. In Walloon French, on the other hand, as shown by Schifano (2015:82–3), the infinitive cannot raise across *déjà*. This variety displays very low movement of the infinitive.[11]

Low verb movement is also demonstrated by the fact that lexical infinitives cannot raise over the negator *pas* in French (57a), only auxiliary infinitives can (57b), and, more marginally, modals:

(57) a. *Ne (pas) sembler (*pas) heureux est*   *une condition* *pour* *écrire*   *des romans.*

       NEG NEG   seem.INF (not) happy   be.3SG   a condition   for   write.INF of.the novels

       'Not seeming happy is a condition for writing novels.'

    b. *Ne (pas) être*   *(pas) heureux est*   *une*   *condition pour écrire*   *des romans.*

       NEG NEG   be.INF NEG   happy   be.3SG   a   condition for   write.INF of.the novels

       'To be unhappy is a condition for writing novels.'

                                                        (Fr., Pollock 1989:373-4)

Other NPIs, which are located lower in the Cinquean hierarchy, can marginally be crossed by the infinitive:

---

[11] Incidentally, Walloon French also features very low movement of N(ouns) which are preceded by virtually all classes of adjectives (just like Germanic) (Bernstein 1991).

(58) *Ne pas/plus fumer *pas/?plus*
   NEG NEG/anymore smoke.INF NEG/anymore
   'Not to smoke (anymore).'

                   (Fr. Rowlett 2007:108)

Pas lexicalises the specifier of the NegP immediately under TP (lower than TP1 but higher than TP2 in Zanuttini's (1997a:236) terms). We expect therefore that the optional movement cannot apply to any heads higher than Neg. The prediction that these data make is that infinitives necessarily follow the adverbs in the HAS, which is, however, not borne out at all:

(59) a. *Partir maintenant (??partir) pour l'étranger l'enthousiasmait.*
    leave.INF now   leave.INF for the=abroad him=make.enthusiastic.IPFV.3SG
    'Leaving now for a foreign country made him enthusiastic.'

  b. *Gagner peut-être (*gagner) à la loterie le faisait   espérer.*
    win.INF maybe win.INF at the lottery him=make.IPFV.3SG hope.INF
    'Maybe winning at the lottery gave him hope.'

  c. ?*Être possiblement (*?être) rejeté fait   peur à tous.*
    be.INF possibly   be.INF rejected make.3SG fear to all
    'Everyone is afraid of possibly being rejected.'

  d. ?*Perdre probablement (*perdre) son travail serait   une condition terrible.*
    lose.INF probably   lose.INF his work be.COND.3SG a condition terrible
    'To probably lose one's job would be a terrible condition.'

French infinitival movement thus seems optional across LAS adverbs but is actually obligatory across HAS adverbs. These puzzling results will be discussed further in §4.3 below.

3.3.2 Left-peripheral elements

Infinitival subject clauses can feature both topics and foci, as in the following examples:

(60) a. *(*El vestit adequat) trobar-lo, el vestit adequat, és difícil per a una núvia.*
    the dress right   find.INF=it the dress right be.3SG difficult for DOM a bride.
    'The right dress, finding it is difficult for a bride.'

  b. *(*Un cotxe) comprar un cotxe és car,   però una bicicleta no.*
    a car   buy.INF a car be.3SG expensive but a bicycle NEG
    'Buying a car is expensive, not a bicycle.'

(Cat.)

(61) a. *(Trovarlo), l'abito giusto, (%trovarlo) è difficile per una sposa.*
      find.INF=it the dress right find.INF=it be.3SG difficult for a bride
      'The right dress, finding it is difficult for a bride.'

   b. *Comprare una macchina (*comprare) è costoso, non uno scooter.*
      buy.INF a car buy.INF be.3SG expensive NEG a scooter
      'To buy a car is expensive not a scooter.'

(It.)

(62) a. *(Trovarla) ea soussion (trovarla) no xe sempre fassile.*
      find.INF=it the solution find.inf=it NEG be.3SG always easy
      'The solution, finding it is not always easy.'

   b. *Me piaze parlar sempre in venexian (*sempre), no in italiano.*
      to.me=please.3SG speak.INF always in Venetian always NEG in italian
      'I like to always speak in Venetian, not in Italian.'

(Ven.)

From my data it emerges that in Italian, Catalan, NIDs, and SIDs infinitives cannot be preceded by foci, and only by topics when the whole clause is extraposed. The focus element that is following the infinitive is located in the lower periphery, as can be seen when an adverb is inserted, as in (62b). The focus necessarily follows the adverb of the LAS, which shows that the focus is not in the higher left periphery. The fact that topics and foci follow the infinitive does thus not necessarily mean that they are located within the C-domain, as the lower periphery is employed in these cases, and the infinitive can also be preceded by topics in certain cases. Cinque (1999:227 n.8) finds the same for topics, but gives different data with foci for Italian:

(63) a. *A Gianni scrivere (non a Mario) sarebbe opportuno!*
      to Gianni write.INF NEG to Mario be.COND.3SG appropriate
      'Writing to Gianni, not to Mario, would be appropriate!

   b. **?Quell'informazione, averla già avuta ci dà un vantaggio.*
      that information have.INF=it already had us=give.3SG an advantage
      'That piece of information, to have had it already is an advantage for us.'

(It., Cinque 1999:227 n.8)

There is thus interspeaker variation in terms of whether foci can precede the infinitive, but my speakers prefer the topic to follow the infinitive. This situation is reminiscent of the inflected infinitives; the infinitival clause has a reduced left-periphery, which can host only topics but which is not employed by all speakers, and the verb does not move to the highest position within the CP.

3.3.3 Clitic placement

In most Romance languages, clitics appear in enclisis on the infinitive, as seen in the following representative examples:

(64) *Falar-lhe   seria   um   error.*
     speak.INF=to.him be.COND.3SG a   mistake
      'Speaking to him would be a mistake.'

(EuPt., Roberts 2016:791)

(65) *Cucinarlo   non   è   facile.*
     cook.INF=it   NEG   be.3SG   easy
      'It is not easy to cook it.'

(It.)

In contrast, in Romanian and in French, the clitic appears proclitically:

(66) *Înainte   de a o vinde,   vreau   să citesc   cartea.*
     before   of to it=sell.INF want.1SG   SA read.SBJV.1SG   book.DET
     'Before selling it, I want to read the book.'

(Ro.)

(67) *Il ne   faut   pas le faire.*
     it NEG be.necessary.3SG   NEG it=do.inf
     'You should not do it.'

(Fr.)

These data suggest that the infinitive moves less high in these two languages than according to Kayne (1991). However, this is not confirmed by the adverb data for Romanian, nor the higher adverbs in French. I conclude that this test might not be as robust as previously thought.

3.3.4 Conclusion

The following table gives an overview of the results of this section:

Table 4.5 Movement of infinitive in Romance

Language	Movement infinitive
European Portuguese	HAS
Catalan	C/Fin or HAS?, across 'maybe', $Mod_{irrealis}$
Spanish	In HAS, across 'necessarily' $Mod_{necessity}$
French	Optional across LAS, obligatory across HAS, see §4.3
Italian	In Fin/HAS across probably '$Mod_{epistemic}$'
NIDs	In Fin/HAS across fortunately 'Mod_{eval}'
SIDs	HAS, optionally across 'necessarily' $Mod_{necessity}$
Sardinian	C/HAS across 'fortunately' Mod_{eval}
Romanian	HAS across 'probably' $Mod_{epistemic}$

Generally, infinitives in subject clauses seem to move to a high position in the HAS or Fin, confirming Schifano's (2015; 2018) data. The most noticeable exception is given by French, where movement into the inflectional domain seems entirely optional with LAS adverbs, but not with HAS adverbs. This puzzle will be discussed further in §4.3.

3.4 Aux-to-Comp

The phenomenon of Aux-to-Comp, whereby an auxiliary occurs in complementiser position yielding subject inversion, was first discussed by Rizzi (1982:chap. 3). In Italian, this verb-subject order occurs in five high-register constructions: infinitives selected by epistemic/declarative verbs (68), conditional sentences with dropped *se* 'if' (70), subjunctive complements with dropped *che*, gerunds (71), and nominalised infinitives headed by the article (72) and certain prepositional adjuncts. Other Romance languages feature the same phenomenon, albeit in fewer contexts. European Portuguese has Aux-to-Comp in inflected infinitival complements to epistemic and declarative verbs (69); Spanish has it with uninflected, personal infinitives, complements to epistemic, declarative or factive verbs (in the latter case preceded by the article *el*); and French features Aux-to-Comp in embedded infinitival wh-questions and wh-relatives (73):[12]

(68) *Suppongo   non esser   la situazione suscettibile di ulteriori miglioramenti.*
     suppose.1SG   NEG be.INF   the situation sensitive   of further   improvements
     'I suppose that the situation is not sensitive to further improvements.'

---

[12] None of my informants accepted these sentences so French will not be discussed further in this section.

(It., Rizzi 1982:79–80)

(69) *Eu afirmo   (*os deputados)   terem   os deputados trabalhado   pouco.*
I   claim.1SG   the deputies   have.INF.3.PL   the deputies   worked   little
'I claim that the deputies have worked little.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:87, 98)

(70) a. *Se lui avesse   capito   al volo,   tutto sarebbe   andato   bene.*
        if he   have.SBVJ.IPFV.3SG understood at.the flight all   be.COND.3SG gone   well

    b. (*Lui) *avesse   lui capito   al volo,   tutto sarebbe   andato   bene.*
        he   have.SBVJ.IPFV.3SG he understood at.the flight all   be.COND.3SG gone   well
        'If he had understood right away, everything would have gone well.'

(It., Rizzi 1982:84)

(71) *Essendo Gianni (*essendo) disposto ad aiutarci, …*
be.GER   Gianni   be.GER   willing   to help.INF=us
'Gianni being willing to help us, …'

(It., Rizzi 1982:83)

(72) *L'aver   lui   affermato che ti vuole   aiutare   non implica che   sei*
the have.INF he   confirmed that you=want.3SG help.INF NEG implies that   be.2SG
fuori   dai   guai.
outside   from.the   problems
'Him having confirmed that he wants to help you does not mean that you are out of
trouble.'

(It., Rizzi 1982:85–6)

(73) *Qui Pierre   croit-il   avoir   frappé   un voleur?*
who   Pierre   believe.3SG=he have.INF hit   a burglar
'Who does Pierre believe to have hit a burglar?'

(Fr., Bošković 1997:68)

This learnèd phenomenon is stylistically marked, albeit to various degrees for these classes of examples. With the Italian infinitives and conditional clauses, the phenomenon is extremely formal. In case of gerunds, inversion occurs in moderately formal registers. The inversion triggered by the drop of the subjunctive complementiser is not natural for all speakers (Rizzi 1982:85; Giorgi & Pianesi 1996:145).

There are restrictions on temporal and aspectual properties of the embedded verb in all languages (Ambar 1994; Bošković 1997:67–8; Ledgeway 2000:295–7; Skytte, Salvi & Manzini 2001:527–9; Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017), here exemplified by EuPt. Stative (74) but not eventive predicates (75) can occur in the Aux-to-Comp construction. The embedded predicate may however consist of an auxiliary with past participle allowing for a single event reading in the past (76a) or if the infinitive is a eventive predicate with a generic or habitual reading (76b):

(74) a. *Penso   estarem   eles   em condições   de apurar   a verdade.*
     think.1SG be.INF.3.PL they   in conditions   to discover.INF the truth
      'I think that they are in the condition to discover the truth.'

   b. *Afirmo   serem   eles   capazes de resolver o problema.*
     declare.1SG be.INF.3.PL   they   able   of solve.INF the problem
      'I declare that they are capable of solving the problem.'
                                        (EuPt., Ambar & Jimenez-Fernandez 2017:2015)

(75) a. **Penso   comerem   os miúdos   este bolo.*
     think.1SG   eat.INF.3PL   the kids   this cake
     'I think that the kids eat this cake.'

   b. **Afirmo   comprarem eles   o livro.*
     declare.1SG buy.INF.3PL they   the book
     'I declare that they buy the book.'
                                        (EuPt., Ambar & Jimenez-Fernandez 2017:2014)

(76) a. *Penso   terem   os meninos   comprado   ontem   o(s) livro(s)*
     think.1SG   have.INF.3.PL the students   bought   yesterday   the books
     recomendado(s).
     recommended
      'I think the students bought the recommended book(s) yesterday.'

   b. *Penso   terem   os meninos   comprado   ultimamente   o(s) livro(s)*
     think.1SG   have.INF.3.PL   the students   bought   lately   the books
     recomendados.
     recommended
      'I think that the students bought the recommended books lately.'
                                        (EuPt., Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:2013)

The phenomenon is not a direct continuation of the Latin *AcI* (cf. chapter 3§2); its subject is nominative, not accusative:

(77) *l'essere   io   disposto ad aiutarvi, ..*
     the be.INF   I.NOM willing   to help.INF=you
     'The fact that I am willing to help you, ..'

<div align="right">(It., Rizzi 1986:87)</div>

3.4.1   Subject positions

The subject occurs obligatorily postverbally in Aux-to-Comp contexts; more specifically, it intervenes between the auxiliary and the rest of the predicate. That this word order is grammatical at all is surprising given the impossibility of this order in finite clauses in modern Romance (Rizzi 1986, Giorgi & Pianesi 1996):

(78) a. **Ha   Mario   accettato   di aiutarci.*
       have.3SG Mario   accepted   of help.INF=us
       'Mario accepted to help us.'
    b. **È   Mario   disposto ad aiutarci.*
       be.3SG   Mario   willing   to help.INF=us
       'Mario is willing to help us.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

It was however allowed in many medieval Romance varieties which were verb-second languages (cf. Wolfe 2019 and references therein). The obligatory inversion in these contexts has been taken as an indication of a high position of the auxiliary (Rizzi 1982:chap. 3), which has been analysed as Comp (just as V2). Assuming a split CP, the question is exactly which position is targeted by the verb: V2 in Romance could be movement to both Fin and Force (Wolfe 2019). We will use adverbs and left peripheral elements as diagnostics to establish more precisely the location of the verb.

3.4.2   Adverbs

With regard to verb movement in this particular construction, Cinque (1999:149) notes that "as expected, the past participle in the Aux-to-Comp absolute construction also precedes all lower AdvPs." This is confirmed by our data:

(79) a. *(*Troppo)   avendo Laura (*troppo)   cotto   troppo   la pasta, gli ospiti*

too.much   have.GER Laura too.much   cooked   too.much   the pasta the guests

si lamentarono.

REFL=complain.PRET.3PL

'Since Laura cooked the pasta too much, the guests complained.'

b.   (*Sempre)   essendo (*sempre) la ragazza (?sempre) stata sempre   in ritardo,   da*

   always   be.GER   always   the girl   always   been always   in delay   from

  quel momento   non   l'aspettarono   più.

  that   moment   NEG   her=await.PRET.3PL   anymore

'Since the girl had always been too late, from that moment on, they did not wait for her anymore.'

(It.)

Indeed, the preferred order for both examples is for the adverb to follow both the auxiliary gerund and the past participle. Both the gerund and participle undergo obligatory movement. However, the movement of the participle is already optional with higher functional heads of the LAS. The movement of the gerund on the other hand is obligatory across all functional heads in the LAS.

Likewise, the infinitive in complements to epistemic and declarative verbs needs to precede all adverbs both from the HAS and the LAS:

(80) a. *Sostengo   non esserci   fortunatamente (*esserci)   state complicazioni.*

     argue.1SG   NEG be.INF=LOC fortunately   be.INF=LOC   been complications

     'I argue that there fortuantely have not been any complications.'

b. *Il direttore ritenne   poter   forse (*poter)   fallire*

     the director believe.PRET.3SG   can.INF   maybe be.able.INF go.bankrupt.INF

     la   ditta.

     the   company

     'The director believed that the company could maybe go bankrupt.'

c. *Afferma   non essere   sempre (*essere)   necessaria   la procedura*

     state.3SG NEG be.INF   always   be.INF   necessary   the procedure

     amministrativa.

     administrative

     'He states that the administrative procedure is not always necessary.'

d. *Dichiaro   non essere   più   (*essere) autorizzata la commissione.*

     declare.1SG   NEG be.INF   anymore be.INF   authorised   the committee

     'I declare the committee to not be authorised anymore.'

(It.)

If the verb is in the C-domain, it should also precede all adverbs from the HAS. This prediction is borne out, but only if the subject also precedes these adverbs.

(81) ?*Ritenevano   aver   probabilmente lui sbagliato   troppe volte.
      think.IPFV.3PL have.INF probably   he made.mistake too.many times
      'They thought he had made mistakes too many times.'

                                                                                    (It.)

(82) *Penso   comprarem evidentemente /necessariamente/felizmente (*?comprarem)*
      think.1SG   buy.INF.3PL evidently   necessarily   fortunately buy.INF.3PL
      eles frequentemente   livros de fisica.
      they frequently   books of physics
      'I think they buy evidently/necessarily/fortunately frequently physics books.'

                                                      (EuPt., Groothuis 2015:78)

(83) *Lamento   el (*estúpidamente)   haber   (*estúpidamente) comido (?estúpidamente) los*
      regret.1SG the (stupidly)   have.INF stupidly   eaten   stupidly   the
      niños   (estúpidamente)   demasiadas chocolatinas.
      children stupidly   too.many   chocolates
      'I regret that the children have stupidly eaten too many chocolates.'

                                                                                    (Sp.)

According to Belletti (2008:37–38), nothing can intervene between the auxiliary and the subject because that would block Case-assignment. Indeed, in the following examples of gerunds with *Aux-to-Comp*, speakers prefer the order in which both subject and infinitive precede the adverb:

(84) a. *??Avendo   fortunatamente   l'alunno studiato,   il maestro era   contento.*
         have.GER   fortunately   the student studied the teacher be.IPFV.3SG happy
      b. *Fortunatamente   avendo   l'alunno   studiato, il maestro   era   contento.*
         fortunately   have.GER the student studied, the teacher be.IPFV.3SG happy
      c. *?Avendo l'alunno   fortunatamente   studiato, il maestro   era   contento.*
         have.GER the student fortunately   studied   the teacher be.IPFV.3SG happy
         'The student having fortunately studied, the teacher was happy.'

                                                                                    (It.)

(85) a. *Avendo   lui   probabilmente accettato di aiutarti…*

have.GER he probably accepted of help.INF=you

   b. ?*Avendo   *probabilmente lui accettato di aiutarti…*

      have.GER   probably   he accepted of help.INF=you

(It.)

This seems to indicate that both the subject and infinitive or gerund need to move to the C-domain, otherwise the subject is expected to follow higher adverbs such as *fortunatamente* 'fortunately' and *probabilmente* 'probably'*.*

3.4.3 Left-peripheral elements

Focalisation is possible in complements to epistemic and declarative verbs:

(86) *A Maria disse   só   ontem   o terem(*-no)   visto.*

     the Mary say.PRET.3SG   only yesterday him=have.INF.3PL seen

     'Mary said that only yesterday did they see him.'

(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 685)

(87) *Penso   só   eles   terem   votado   a proposta.*

     think.1SG   only they have.INF.3.PL   voted   the proposal

     'I think that only they have voted for the proposal.'

(EuPt., Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:5 n.2)

(88) **Creio   esse livro,   terem-o   já   lido.*

     believe.1SG this book   have.INF.3.PL=it already read

     'This book, I believe they already read it.

(EuPt.)

This indicates that the left periphery can be activated in an inflected infinitival clause by moving elements into a Focus position. Topicalisation, on the other hand, is not possible. The inflected infinitive follows the focused constituent. From this, we can conclude that the inflected infinitive is located in a relatively low position within the C-domain, such as Fin.

    In Italian, in contrast, only the lower focus position is available, as can be seen in the following example:

(89) *La commissione   ritiene   (*il bilancio)   aver   (*il bilancio) la ditta   (*il*

the committee   believe.3SG the balance   have.INF the balance the company   the

bilancio) falsificato   il bilancio,   non   gli altri   documenti.

balance falsified   the balance NEG   the other   documents

 'The committee believes that the company has falsified the balance, not the other

documents.'

(It.)

Focused elements will therefore not be informative about the exact location of the auxiliary infinitive within the left periphery in Italian.

3.4.4   Clitic positions

Enclisis is the only possibility in infinitival clauses that are the complement to epistemic verbs (90), as well as gerunds. However, in EuPt., enclisis is not allowed when an operator such as negation or focus is present in the clause. In that case, as shown in (91) and (92), only proclisis is allowed, just as in finite clauses:

(90) *A Maria   disse   (*o) terem-no   visto ontem.*

the Mary   say.PRET.3SG   him=have.INF.PL =him   seen   yesterday

 'Mary said that they saw him yesterday.'

(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 684)

(91) *Ela pensa   não a terem(*-na)   os rapazes visto.*

she think.3SG   NEG her =have.INF.3.PL=her the boys   seen

 'She thinks that the boys have not seen her.'

(EuPt., Madeira 1994:196)

(92) *A Maria   disse   só ontem   o terem(*-no)   visto.*

the Mary   say.PRET.3SG   only yesterday   him=have.INF.PL =him   seen

 'Mary said that only yesterday they saw him.'

(EuPt., Raposo & Uriagereka 2005: 685)

Given the change in position of the clitic when a focused element or negation is present, we can assume that both focus and negation interfere with the movement of the inflected infinitive to its regular high position within the C-domain.

With gerunds, the clitic appears in enclisis. This clitic placement therefore does not match up with the results from adverb placement and will be taken to reflect other cross-linguistic variation than (only) verb movement.

3.4.5   Conclusion

The result of the preceding sections can be summarised with the following table:

Table 4.6 Movement of Aux-to-Comp Verbs in Romance

Language	V-movement Aux-to-Comp
Italian	C-domain
Portuguese	Fin (lower in case of Neg/Focus)
Spanish	HAS/C-domain

In Portuguese and Italian, the infinitival form of Aux-to-Comp moves into a position within the CP as it obligatorily precedes all the adverbs of the Cinquean hierarchy. The exact position within the CP is unclear for Italian, as focalisation is impossible within the left periphery of the clause. For EuPt., the position of focused constituents is preceding the inflected infinitive, which might therefore be located in a low position within the CP. However, since the clitic in those cases appears in proclisis rather than enclisis, it is probably the case that focus interferes with the verb movement. The verb might be in a lower position whenever a focused element is fronted.

3.5 Gerunds

3.5.1   Adverbs

Gerunds in all the languages under examination raise out of the LAS, as can be shown by the fact that they necessarily precede all LAS adverbs:

(93) a. *Leyendo completamente (*leyendo) los libros,   aprobarás   el examen.*
   read.GER completely   read.GER the books   pass.FUT.2SG   the exam
   'If you read the books completely, you will pass the exam.'

   b. *Estudiando siempre   (*estudiando), aprobarás   el examen.*
   study.GER   always   study.GER   pass.FUT.2SG   the exam
   'If you always study, you will pass the exam.'

   c. *María ganó   una medalla   cantando   bien (*cantando).*
   Maria win.PRET.3SG   a medal   sing.GER   well   singing

'Maria won a medal by singing well.'

(Sp.)

(94) a. *Nous nous sommes   échappés en courant vite   (*courant).*
we   REFL=be.1SG   escaped in run.GER   quick run.GER
'We escaped running quickly.'

b. *Il communiquait   avec son chef   en utilisant toujours (en utilisant) son numéro*
he communicate.IPFV.3SG   with his boss   in use.GER   always   in use.GER   his number
personnel.
personal
'He communicated with his boss using always his personal number.'

c. *N'ayant   plus   (*ayant) d'argent,   Marc a   dû   revenir   à*
NEG=have.GER   anymore have.GER of=money   Marc have.3SG must   come.back.INF at
la   maison.
the   house
'Not having money anymore, Marc had to come back home.'

(Fr.)

(95) a. *Lezendo ben (*lezendo) ea   riceta,   so   sta   bon   de far   dei bigoli*
read.GER well read.GER   that   recipe   be.1SG   been good of make.INF of.the bigoli
in salsa.
in sauce.
'Reading the recipe well, I have been good at making bigoli in salsa.'

b. *Magnando   masa   (*magnando), Beppi se ga   sentio mal.*
eat.GER   too.much eat.GER   Beppe REFL=have.3SG felt bad
'Eating too much, Beppe did not feel well.'

(Ven.)

(96) a. *A   caştigat competiţia   cântând bine (*cântând).*
have.3SG won   competition.DET sing.GER well   sing.GER
'S/he has won the competition by singing well.'

b. *Învăţând   întotdeauna (*invaţând), ai   trece   examenul.*
learn.GER   always   learn.GER AUX.FUT.2SG pass.INF exam.DET
'By always studying, you will pass the exam.'

(Ro.)

(97) a. *Semus   essios   currende lestros (*currende).*

be.1PL   gone.out   run.GER quickly run.GER

'We went out running quickly.'

b. *(*Troppu) avende (*troppu)   manicau troppu, Giuseppe si est   intesu male.*

too.much have.GER too.much   eaten   too.much   Giuseppe REFL=be.3SG felt   bad

'Having eaten too much, Giuseppe felt bad.'

c. *A   bintu sa gara   sonande bene (*sonande)   sa chitarra.*

have.3SG   won the match play.GER well play.GER   the guitar

'He has won the competition by playing the guitar well.'

(Srd., Orani (NU))

That gerunds raise very high is shown by the following examples. All speakers tend to place all HAS adverbs after the gerund, whether it is an auxiliary or full lexical verb:

(98) a. *Equivocando-se   estúpidamente (*equivocando-se)   de dirección,*

make.mistake.GER =REFL   stupidly   make.mistake.GER =REFL of direction,

llegó   muy   tarde.

arrive.PRET.3SG very late

'Stupidly getting the direction wrong, he arrived very late.'

b. *Trabajando ahora (*trabajando), lo acabaré   manaña.*

worki.GER now   work.GER   it=finish.FUT.1SG tomorrow

'Working now, I'll finish it tomorrow.'

(Sp.)

(99) a. *En partant maintenant (*en partant), nous pourrions   arriver   à l'heure.*

in leave.GER now   in leave.GER we   can.COND.1PL   arrive.INF   at the hour

'If we leave now, we could arrive in time.

b. *Je me suis   perdue   dans le vieux centre de la cité,   (en me trompant)*

I me=be.1SGlost   in   the old centre of the city   in me=err.GER

apparemment (en me trompant)   de route.

apparently   in me=err.GER   of street

'I got lost in the old city centre because I got the route wrong.'

(Fr.)

(100) a. *Savendo   fortunatamente (#savendo)   tute le risposte,   passò   l'esame.*

know.GER   fortunately   know.GER   all the answers   pass.pret.3SG   the exam

'Fortunately knowing all the answers, he passed the exam.'

b. *(purtroppo)   sbagiando   strada   (purtroppo),   so   rivà   tardi.*
   unfortunately make.mistake.GER street   unfortunately be.1SG   arrived   late
   'Unfortunately making a mistake in the route, I arrived late.'

(Ven.)

(101) a. *Cumenzande   como (*cumenzande), as   a inire   su trabballu in tempus.*
      start.GER   now start.GER   AUX.FUT.2SG to finish.INF the work   in time
      'If you start now, you will finish the job on time.'

   b. *?Essendesi stupidamente (*essendesi) sbaliau,   a   perdiu   tottu su dinare.*
      be.GER=REFL stupidly   be.GER =REFL mistaken, have.3SG lost   all   the money
      'Having stupidly made an error, he lost all the money.'

(Srd., Orani (NU))

(102) a. *Greşind   proşteste (*greşind)   strada din nou,   am   ajuns prea*
      err.GER   stupidly   err.GER   street of new   have.1SGe   arrived too
      târziu.
      late
      'Stupidly getting the route wrong, I arrived too late.'

   b. *(plecând)   acum (*plecând), aş   putea   să ajung   la timp.*
      leave.GER   now leave.GER   AUX.COND.1SG   can.INF   SA arrive.1SG   to time
      'Leaving now, I could arrive on time.'

(Ro.)

There is thus a clear indication that the gerund occupies a high position within the IP in all languages.

3.5.2   Left-peripheral elements

Foci can only follow the gerund in Italian, as can be seen in the following example:

(103) a. *Mi sono   preparata   all'esame,   leggendo   QUESTO LIBRO (*leggendo), non*
      REFL=be.1SG prepared   to.the exam,   read.GER   this book   read.GER   NEG
      quell'altro.
      that other
      'I prepared for the exam reading this book, not that other one.'

   b. *Mi sono   preparata   all'esame   leggendo bene QUESTO LIBRO   (bene),   non*
      REFL=be.1SG prepared   to.the exam,   read.GER well this book   well   NEG

quell'altro.

that other

'I prepared for the exam reading this book well, not that other one.'

(It.)

The fact that the adverb can follow and precede the focus phrase shows that the gerund must always precede the focused constituent, whether it is located in the higher or lower left periphery. The gerund is therefore probably located in the C-domain, possibly Force.

3.5.3 Clitic placement

Almost all Romance languages place the clitic after the gerund, here exemplified by European Portuguese, Venetan and Romanian. In French, on the other hand, clitics appear in proclisis on the gerund:

(104) *Enganando-me   no itinerário,   cheguei   atrasado.*

make.mistakes.GER=REFL   in.the route   arrive.PRET.1SG late

'Stupidly making a mistake on the route, I arrived late.'

(EuPt.)

(105) *Go   cusinà   el pesse (*lo) sfritegandolo.*

have.1SG cooked   the fish (it=) fry.GER=it

'I have cooked the fish by frying it.'

(Ven.)

(106) *(*îl) vâzându-l,   am   fugit   imediat.*

see.GER=him,   have.1SG run.away   immediately

'When I saw him, I ran away immediately.'

(Ro.)

(107) *Lui disant   que, ..*

to.him=say.GER that

'Saying to him that..'

(Fr., Roberts 2016:794)

This seems to suggest that French gerunds move lower than gerunds in other Romance languages. However, this is not confirmed by the adverb data, and thus has to be explained with a different position of the clitic (cf. the infinitive in §3.3.3 above) in French, which will be left aside here. Again, clitic placement does not seem to correlate exactly with verb movement.

3.5.4 Conclusion

Table 4.7 Movement of gerunds in Romance

Language	Movement gerund
European Portuguese	HAS/C across 'probably' $Mod_{epistemic}$
Spanish	HAS/C across 'stupidly' $Mood_{evaluative}$
Catalan	HAS/C across 'apparently' $Mod_{evidential}$
French	HAS/C across 'apparently' $Mod_{evidential}$
Italian	HAS/C across 'stupidly' $Mood_{eval}$ and focus
NIDs	HAS/C across 'fortunately' $Mood_{eval}$
Sardinian	HAS/C across 'stupidly' $Mood_{eval}$
Romanian	HAS/C across 'stupidly' $Mood_{eval}$

Gerunds move quite uniformly across Romance. They all occupy a high position within the HAS. The Italian gerund can even raise higher into the C-domain, given the fact that it can precede foci.

3.6 Past participial clauses

In formal registers, Romance languages can use an absolute construction featuring a past participle which forms a subordinate clause which can be syntactically independent from the matrix clause (Belletti 1990:chap. 2; 2006; Perlmutter 1989; Loporcaro 2003; De Roberto 2012). Past participial clauses[13] are formed by a past participle followed by a DP and possibly some other complements of the verb. There is obligatory agreement in gender and number between the past participle and the DP:

(108) a. *Finit**a***   *la festa,*   *tutti*   *tornarono*   *a casa.*
      finished.PTC.F.SG   the party   all   return.PRET.3PL   at home
      'After the party finished, everyone returned home.'

   b. *Vendut**a***   *la casa,*   *la famiglia si trasferì*   *all'estero.*

---

[13] Often referred to as 'absolute past participles', but, as will become clear below, not all instances of past participle clauses are 'absolute' in that they are connected to the matrix clause. Terminology within the literature can be confusing at times (cf. Loporcaro 2003:202ff.).

Sold.PTC.F.SG   the house   the family REFL=move.PRET.3SG   to.the=abroad

'After selling the house, the family moved abroad.'

(It.)

As can be seen in (108), absolute past participial clauses can be formed with both unaccusative (108a) and transitive (108b) verbs. It is however generally impossible with unergative verbs (Perlmutter 1989; Belletti 2006), as exemplified here by Catalan (109). Similar results are reported for Brazilian Portuguese (Schmitt 1998:287), Italian and Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994:183 n. 60; Pană Dindelegan 2013b:228).

(109) a. *Un cop nascuda   la criatura,   triarem   el nom*.
    a time born.PTC   the creature   choose.FUT1.PL the name
    'Once the child will be born, we will choose the name.'

b. *Hi aniran   a viure   un cop restaurada   la casa   per un   bon arquitecte.*
    LOC=go.FUT.3SG to live.INF   a time renovated.PTC   the house   by a   good architect
    'They will go to have a look, once the house will have been renovated.ptc by a good architect.'

c. **Una volta saltats   els atletes,   vam tornar   cap   a casa*.
    a time jumped.PTC   the athletes   go.1PL return.INF   again at house
    'Once the athletes jumped, we went back home.'

(Cat., Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016:1208)

This has famously been captured by Perlmutter's (1989) generalisation, who argues that the possibility of occurring in absolute participial clauses is a piece of evidence for the division of intransitive verbs into unergatives and unaccusatives, as only the latter can form an absolute past participle clause.[14]

---

[14] However, whereas this generalisation seems to hold for most Romance languages, in Italian, past participle clauses are not excluded with all types of unergatives (cf. Dini 1994; Loporcaro 2003):

(i)   *Vendemmiato,   i contadini   lasciarono   il paese.*
      harvested.PTC   the farmers   leave.PRET.3PL the town
      'Having harvested, the farmers left the town.'

(It., Loporcaro 2003:214)

Both semantics and syntax determine the grammaticality of unergative verbs within past participle clauses. With regards to semantics, it is important the verb be non-additive/telic (Loporcaro 2003:220). In fact, this generalisation holds also for transitive verbs: some activity verbs become acceptable in a past participle clause when the direct object is definite, rather than indefinite, rendering thus the event telic.

At a syntactic level, it is important to distinguish between *absolute* past participial clauses and *dependent* past participial clauses (Loporcaro 2003). Even though they are commonly referred to as 'absolute' clauses, past participial clauses can be controlled by a matrix subject, by an argument of the matrix verb or by an adjunct. Absolute (in *stricto sensu*) or uncontrolled past participial clauses, on the other hand, are not controlled by an argument in the matrix clause. The two types are distinguished by syntactic properties. *Ne*-cliticisation of the argument has been claimed to be generally impossible in absolute clauses (Belletti 2008:78–79). However, Loporcaro (2003:237) shows that *ne*-pronominalisation is possible in controlled PPCs, but not in absolute/uncontrolled PPCs. Similarly, cliticisation of the direct object is grammatical in controlled past participial clauses, but not in uncontrolled ones.

3.6.1   Subject positions

In Catalan and Italian, the subject of an absolute past participle clause appears postverbally, as can be seen in the following examples:

(110) *Un cop nascuda   la criatura,   triarem   el nom.*
      a time born.PTC   the creature   choose.FUT1.PL the name
      'Once the child will be born, we will choose the name.'

<div align="right">(Cat., Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016:1208)</div>

(111) *Arrivata   Sandra (*arrivata),   Gianni andò   a   prenderla.*
      arrived.PTC Sandra arrived.PTC   Gianni go.PRET.3SG to pick.up.INF=het
      'Once Sandra had arrived, Gianni went to pick her up.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

In French, on the other hand, the subject appears preverbally:

(112) *Le train à peine   arrivé,   Silvie est   descendue.*
      the train at sorrow   arrived.PTC Silvie be.3SG gone.down
      'As soon as the train arrived, Silvie got off.'

<div align="right">(Fr.)</div>

Romanian past participial clauses distinguish themselves from their Romance counterparts in that they allow two subject positions, a preverbal and a postverbal one, where the postverbal is the most neutral. The preverbal position needs to be marked as a topic or a focus (Ștefania Costea, p.c.):

(113) a. *(Făcute)*   *temele*   *(făcute),*   *profesoara*   *ne-a*   *laudat.*
     made.PTC   homework.DET made.PTC,   professor.DET   us=have.3SG praised
     'Having done the homework, the professor praised us.'

     b. *(Ajunsă)*   *mama*   *(ajunsă)*   *acasă,*   *a*   *şi*   *început ploaia.*
     arrived.PTC mum.DET   arrived.PTC at.home   have.3SG also   started rain.DET
     'After mum had arrived home, it started raining.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

The postverbal subject position could be an indication of high verb movement, but could also be caused by the subject remaining *in situ*. This latter possibility can be excluded on the basis of the following examples, which show that the subject has moved, stranding a floating quantifier in a lower position:

(114) *Arrivati*   *finalmente*   *i suoi figli*   *tutti*   *a casa,*   *la mamma*   *poteva*   *stare*
     arrived.PTC finally   the her children all   at house the mom   can.IPFV.3SG stay.INF
     tranquilla.
     calm
     'After all her children finally arrived home, the mum could be calm.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

(115) *Copiii lui*   *(ajunşi)*   *în sfârşit*   *(ajunşi)*   *toţi*   *acasă,*   *mama*
     children=her.GEN arrived.PTC in end   arrived.PTC all   at.home mum.DET
     era   *calmă.*
     be.IPFV.3SG   calm
     ' (All) her children having finally arrived at home, the mum was calm.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

If the postverbal subject has moved out of the VP, this means that the past participle is also located within the I-domain (or higher).

3.6.2   Adverbs

As with the infinitives in the preceding sections, the location of the verb will be established with various diagnostics, the most important one being the relative position of the verb and adverbs. According to Cinque (1999: 149), Italian absolute past participles can be found to either precede

or follow habitual adverbs, negative adverbs, *già* 'already', *più* '(any)more', *sempre* 'always' and *completamente* 'completely', but they have to precede *bene* 'well'. My informants, however, seem to prefer to move the past participle across all LAS as shown in the following examples of dependent participial clauses:

(116) a. *Fatti bene (*fatti) i compiti, potevamo finire il corso.*
   done.PTC well done.PTC the homework can.IPFV.1PL finish.INF the course
   'After having done the homework well, we could finish the course.'

  b. *Finiti già (*?finiti) i taralli, la signora va dal panettiere.*
   finished.PTC already finished.PTC the taralli the woman go.3SG to.the baker
   'Having already finished the taralli, the woman goes to the baker.'

  c. *Non vista più (*vista) Maria, tutti iniziarono a preoccuparsi.*
   NEG seen.PTC anymore seen.PTC Maria all start.PRET.3PL to worry.INF=REFL
   'Not having seen Maria anymore, everyone started to worry.'

                       (It.)

(117) a. *Feta ja (*feta) tota la feina, se'n va anar a dormir.*
   done.PTC already done.PTC all the work REFL=of.it=go.3sg go.INF to sleep.INF
   'Having already finished all the work, s/he went to sleep.'

  b. *Destrossada completament (*destrossada) la casa, els lladres van marxar.*
   destroyed.PTC completely destroyed.PTC the house the thieves go march.INF
   'Having destroyed the house completely, the thieves left.'

                       (Cat.)

(118) a. *Făcute bine (*făcute) temele, profesoara ne-a laudat.*
   made.PTC well made.PTC homework.DET professor.DET us=have.3SG praised

  b. *Odată discutate des (*discutate), subiectele nu mai*
   once discussed.PTC often discussed.PTC subjects.DET NEG anymore
   reprezentau un punct de interes pentru noi.
   represent.IPFV.3PL a point of interest for us
   'Having discussed them often, subjects are not a point of interest anymore.'

                       (Ro.)

Similarly, there is a tendency to place the HAS adverb after the past participle as well, at least in Italian. In Catalan, both positions are grammatical:

(119) a. *Finita fortunamente (*finita) la scuola, ci sentimmo liberi.*

finished.PTC finally   finished.PTC the school   us=feel.PRET.1PL   free

'When school finally finished, we felt free.'

b. *Superato   probabilmente/evidentemente (?superato) l'esame,   Marco decise*

passed.PTC probably   /evidently   passed.PTC the exam Marco decide.PRET.3SG

di prendersi   una vacanza.

of take.INF=REFL   a holiday

'Having probably/evidently passed the exam, Marco decided to take a holiday.'

c. *Vinto   fortunatamente (?vinto)   il concorso,   la ragazza poté   realizzare*

won.PTC finally   won.PTC the competition, the girl   can.PRET.3SG realise.INF

il   suo   sogno.

the   her   dream

'Having finally won the competition, the girl could make her deam come true.'

(It.)

(120) *(Assasinada)   malauradament   (assassinada)   tota la població,*

murdered.PTC unfortunately   murdered.PTC all the population,

la ciutat va   quedar   deserta.

the city go.3SG   remain.INF deserted

'After the whole population was unfortunately murdered, the city was deserted.'

(Cat.)

(121) a. *Găsită   poate   de un străin,   scrisoarea nu ar   mai   fi*

found   maybe   by a stranger letter.DET   not AUX.COND.3SG anymore be.INF

ajuns   la mine.

arrived   at mine

'Maybe if the letter had been found by a stranger, it would not have arrived at my

place.'

b. *(terminate)   din fericire (*terminate) cursurile,   am   plecat   în vacanţă.*

finished.PTC   of happiness finished.PTC courses.DET have.1SG left   in holiday

'With the courses fortunately finished, I left on holiday.'

(Ro.)

The situation is not very different for absolute (in the narrow sense) past participial clauses in Italian. The participle precedes all adverbs, with the exception of the aspectual adverb *appena* 'as soon as':

(122) a. *(*?uscita)*   *appena*   *uscita*   *la nuova versione, compro*   *il telefono.*

        come.out.PTC   as.soon.as   come.out.PTC   the new version   buy.1SG   the phone

        'As soon as the new version came out, I will buy the phone.'

   b. *Lasciata evidentemente (*lasciata)*   *la casa,*   *i ladri*   *entrarono.*

        left.PTC   evidently   left.PTC   the house   the thieves   enter.PRET.3PL

        'As the house was evidently abandoned, the thieves entered.'

   c. *Non arrivata ancora (*arrivata)*   *la festeggiata, la festa*   *non*   *poteva*   *cominciare.*

        NEG arrived.PTC yet   arrived.PTC   the party.girl   the party NEG   can.IPFV.3SG start.INF

        'As the guest of honour had not arrived yet, the party could not start.'

                                                                           (It.)

From these data it can be concluded that the past participle of both unaccusative and transitive verbs can precede most HAS and LAS adverbs, with the exception of *appena* 'as soon as', which acts as a conjunction in these types of clauses (cf. also Cat. *un cop, una vegada* 'once'). This indicates a movement of the participle into a very high position in the IP or even into the CP (for both unaccusative and transitive verbs).

     French past participle clauses show a very different pattern than the ones in Catalan, Italian and Romanian. The past participle stays in a low position, and cannot even raise over *bien* 'well':

(123) a. *Marie*   *(*partie) déjà*   *(partie), Marc ne*   *pouvait*   *plus*

        Marie   left.PTC   already   left.PTC   Marc NEG   can.IPFV.3SG anymore

        lui déclarer   *son amour.*

        to.her=declare.INF his love

        'Marie already having left, Marc could not declare his love to her anymore.'

   b. *Les devoirs*   *(*faits) bien*   *(faits),*   *les copains pouvaient*   *sortir.*

        the homework done.PTC well   done.PTC the friends can.IPFV.3PL go.out.INF

        'Having done their homework well, the friends could go out.'

   c. *L'examen (?réussi)*   *probablement (réussi),*   *Marc a*   *décidé*   *d'aller*

        the exam passed.PTC probably   passed.PTC Marc have.3SG   decided   of=go.INF

        en vacances.

        holiday

        'Having probably passed the exam, Marc has decided to go on holiday.'

   d. *Le livre*   *(?lu)*   *complètement (lu),*   *j'étais*   *dévenue une experte*

        the book   read.PTC completely   read.PTC I=be.IPFV.1SG   become   an expert

        de la matière.

        of the subject

        'Having read the book completely, I had become an expert on the subject.'

The contrast is less strong with *complètement* 'completely', indicating maybe optional movement into a LAS position. The optional movement with the high adverb *probablement* 'probably' is probably due to its use as a parenthetical.

3.6.3   Left-peripheral elements

The absolute past participle clause seems to lack a left periphery, as foci necessarily need to follow both the past particle and a low adverb such as *bene* 'well':

(124) (*Il libro)   *studiato*   *bene il libro,*   *non*   *l'articolo,*   *ho*   *capito*
the book   studied.PTC well the book   NEG   the article   have.1SG understood
il fenomeno.
the   phenomenon
 'Having studied the book well, not the article, I understood the phenomenon.'

(It.)

Topics seem to be generally ungrammatical:

(125) **Il libro,*   *lettolo*   *completamente,*   *ho*   *capito*   *il fenomeno*.
the book   read.PTC=it completely   have.1SG understood the phenomenon
 'The book, having read it completely, I understood the phenomenon.'

(It.)

It can be concluded that the left periphery in these clauses is reduced in participial clauses.

3.6.4   Clitic placement

In Italian, clitics can appear in enclisis on absolute past participles:

(126) *Arrestatine*   *molti,*   *la   polizia poté*   *sedare*   *il tumulto*.
arrested.PTC=PART many,   the police   can.PRET.3SG   soothe.INF   the commotion
 'Having arrested many of them, the police could soothe the commotion.'

(It., Loporcaro 2003:237)

This enclitic position confirms the high movement of the verb. None of the other Romance languages allows cliticisation on the past participle in this particular construction (Loporcaro 2003:243; Roberts 2016:794).

3.6.5 Conclusion

The results of this section are summarised in the following table:

Table 4.8 Movement of absolute participles in Romance

Language	PTC movement in PPCs
Italian	C/HAS across 'fortunately' Mood_{eval}
Catalan	C/HAS optionally across 'fortunately' Mood_{eval}
French	None (not across *bien* 'well')
Romanian	Across 'apparently' Mood_{evidential}

It has been shown that there is no substantial difference in placement in the infinitive between absolute and controlled past participles. However, there is much variation between the languages. Whereas in Catalan, Romanian, and Italian, both adverbs and subject position indicate a high verb movement, the opposite is found in French.

3.7 Romanian supine

The presence of the supine is a feature unique to Romanian among the Romance languages. Morphologically identical to the masculine singular of the past participle, it is a non-finite form of the verb which bears no agreement and no tense or mood marking (Pană Dindelegan 2013c; Maiden 2016:113; Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016). Usually, its subject is controlled or PRO_{arb}. Its verbal distribution is quite limited, appearing in tough-constructions (127a), as a modifier of a DP (127b) and as complement to aspectual verbs (128):

(127) a. *Este   greu de vorbit   româna.*
      be.3SG   hard to speak.SUP Romanian.DET
      'It is hard to speak Romanian.'

   b. *maşină   de spălat   vase*
      machine of wash.SUP cups
      'dishwasher'

(Ro.)

The supine cannot host pronominal clitics, negation or adverbials, which all have to occur on the matrix verb:

(128) a. *Termină   de scris   articolul.*
       finish.3SG   of write.SUP article.DET

    b. **Termină   de îl/mai/ne-/nu scris.*
       finish.3SG   of it/yet/NEG=write.SUP

    c. *Nu îl mai termină   de scris.*
       NEG=it=yet= finish.3SG   of write.SUP
       'S/he hasn't yet finished writing it.'

<div align="right">(Ro., Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016:13)</div>

Based on these facts, Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2016:13) conclude that the Romanian supine has reduced functional structure, consisting of a mere IP. This makes predictions for adverbs that can appear and suggests that a left periphery is impossible.

(129) a. *E   greu de scris   bine (*scris)   articolul.*
       be.3SG   hard of write.SUP well   write.SUP article.DET
       'It is hard to write the article well.'

    b. *E   greu de scris   rapid   (*scris)   un articol bun (rapid).*
       be.3SG   hard of write.SUP quickly   write.SUP   an article good quickly
       'It is hard to write a good article quickly.'

    c. *E   greu de citit   complet   (*citit)   cartea.*
       be.3SG   hard of read.SUP   completely (write.sup) book.DET
       'It is hard to read the book completely.'

    d. *E   simplu   de inventat   mereu (*inventat)   scuze.*
       be.3SG   easy   of invent.SUP   always (invent.SUP)   excuses
       'It is easy to always come up with excuses.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

(130) a. *?Termină   de scris   bine articolul.*
       finish.3SG   of write.SUP well article.DET
       'S/he finishes writing well the article.'

    b. *Termină   de scris   rapid (*scris)   un articol bun.*
       finish.3SG   of write.SUP quickly write.SUP a article good
       'S/he finishes writing quickly a good article.'

The supine raises over adverbs from the LAS.

A focus phrase occurs before *de* or clause-finally:

(131) a. *Termină articolul de scris, nu cartea.*
   finish.3SG article.DET of write.SUP NEG book.DET

  b. *Termină de scris articolul, nu cartea.*
   finish.3SG of article.DET write.SUP NEG book.DET

   'S/he finishes writing the article, not the book.'

This seems to indicate that the supine clause includes a focus position in the lower left periphery.

The supine can have a lexically specified nominative subject in certain cases: when the supine occurs in a relative clause (132), when the head is an externalised locative adjunct; or when the supine represents a passive structure in the presence of a by-phrase (133):

(132) a. *masă de stat patru persone.*
   table of stay.SUP four people
   'a table for four people'

  b. *corturi de jocat copiii.*
   tents of play.SUP children.DET
   'tents for children to play in'

(133) *E greu de rezolvat problema de către toţi copiii.*
  be.3SG difficult of work-out.SUP problem by all children
  'It is hard for all the children to work out the problem.'

A lexical subject is very rare with the supine and there are no examples attested with adverbs. They are acceptable for some speakers (Adina Dragomirescu, p.c.):

(134) a. %*Masă de stat (uşor/confortabil) patru persoane (uşor/confortabil).*
   table of stay.SUP (easily/comfortably) four people (easily/comfortably)
   'A table at which four people can easily/comfortably sit.'

  b. %*Masa de stat probabil patru persoane (probabil).*
   table of stay.SUP probably four people probably

'A table at which probably four people can sit.'

Floating quantifiers are marginal when left stranded. Their possibility, however marginal, potentially indicates that the subject has moved out of the VP, as the floating quantifier can be stranded.

(135) *Masă de stat   (toți) copiii   (?toți).*
    table of stay.SUP   all.PL children all
    'A table at which all the children can sit.'

(Ro.)

LAS adverbs always follow the supine:

(136) a. *E   greu de scris   bine (*scris)   articolul   de către studentul tânăr.*
      be.3SG   hard of write.SUP well (write.sup)   article.DET   by student.DET   young
      'It is hard for the young student to write an article well.'

    b. *E   greu de scris   rapid (*scris)   un articol bun de către student.*
      be.3SG   hard of write.SUP quickly write.SUP an article good by student
      'It is hard for a student to write a good article quickly.'

    c. *E   greu de citit   complet   (*citit)   cartea   de către studentul tânăr.*
      be.3SG   hard of read.SUP completely read.SUP book.DET by student.DET   young
      'It is hard for the young student to read the book completely.'

(Ro.)

This shows that the supine undergoes a certain degree of movement into the I-domain, at least across aspect-related heads. In the case of the supine with a lexical subject, the supine moves higher, across *probabil* 'probably' in the specifier of Mod$_{epistemic}$.

3.8 Summary results

The results of the preceding sections are schematised in the following table:

Table 4.9 Movement of non-finite verbs in Romance

Language	Infl./personal inf.	Bare infinitives	Aux-to-Comp	Gerund	PPC	Supine
EP	HAS	HAS	HAS/Fin	HAS	X	X
Sp.	HAS	HAS	HAS	HAS	X	X
Cat.	HAS	Fin/HAS	X	C/HAS	C/HAS	X
Fr.	X	LAS/HAS	X	HAS	none	X
It.	X	Fin/HAS	HAS	C	C/HAS	X
NIDs	X	C	X	C/HAS	X	X
SIDs	HAS	C	X	X	X	X
Srd.	HAS	HAS	X	C/HAS	X	X
Ro.	HAS	HAS	X	HAS	HAS	HAS

It can be immediately noted that there is a general tendency for non-finite and semi-finite forms to raise to a high position within IP or to a low position within the C-domain. The rest of this chapter will be dedicated to accounting for the movement patterns attested, but the results will be briefly summarised here.

The various Romance languages with a personal infinitive pattern remarkably similarly in that the personal infinitive occupies a high position within the inflectional domain, as it precedes all the LAS adverbs and can precede most HAS adverbs. The infinitive follows constituents located in the C-domain, such as foci and topics. Inflected infinitives also move in most cases to the HAS. In Portuguese, the context determines its position, in that in non-selected contexts the inflected infinitive always raises to the HAS, but even higher in selected contexts (after epistemic and declarative verbs, i.e. Aux-to-Comp). Finally, the Romanian supine is another non-finite form which moves into the HAS.

The Aux-to-Comp construction seems to confirm its name: the verb necessarily precedes all adverbs and cannot co-occur with a complementiser. Given the fact that foci and topics precede it, the landing site of the infinitive is arguably Fin. Other verb forms that seem to exhibit V-to-C movement are the gerund and the past participle when used in a PPC.

In many respects, French behaves differently to the other Romance languages. It always features proclisis, whereas the general tendency for Romance is to have enclisis with non-finite forms (but, cf. Romanian and EP for different patterns). Furthermore, with both infinitives and past participle constructions, the lower adverbs can also precede the verb, indicating very low verb movement.

4. Analysis of verb movement in non-finite and less-finite clauses

From the preceding section, a general picture has emerged. In non-finite clauses across most Romance varieties, with the exception of French infinitives and PPCs, the non-finite verb moves into a high position within the HAS or the lowest position of the CP, *Fin*. This section will be dedicated to the analysis of these movement patterns, starting with a discussion of possible triggers for verb movement.

4.1 Possible triggers for movement: finite vs non-finite clauses

The first main question is whether the verb movement of finite forms and non-finite verbs are the same processes, triggered by the same formal features. There are reasons to assume that this is not the case. If it were, we would expect differences between Romance languages, in a pattern similar to what we find for finite verb movement. Recall the three types of verb movement displayed by Romance finite verbs (Schifano 2018:166):

Table 4.10 PI of TAM and movement typology (Schifano 2018:166)

Movement typology	PI of TAM
high (French)	Mood [-PI]
medial (N.Reg. Italian)	Mood [+PI], Tense [-PI]
low (E. Portuguese)	Mood [+PI], Tense [+PI], Aspect [-PI]
very low (Spanish)	Mood [+PI], Tense [+PI], Aspect [+PI]

The difference between Romance languages that we find for non-finite verb forms sets French apart from the other Romance languages. Generally, non-finite verb forms move high into the inflectional domain, but French infinitives and past participles do not. This language normally displays very high verb movement in finite clauses.

The property responsible for causing verb movement in finite indicative clauses has to be in some way different in non-finite clauses, resulting in different patterns of movement. In fact, the movement of the non-finite forms is more similar to that of subjunctives (Schifano 2018:228), which targets a higher position than the indicative. In the following sections, several proposals for triggers of verb movement will be discussed in order to see whether they can account for the patterns found in non-finite verb movement.

4.1.1 (ɸ-)agreement with subject

One particular idea which has been around from very early on is that verbs move to the I-domain to 'pick up' their inflection. Inflectionally richer languages have higher verb movement than languages with poor agreement paradigms (Roberts 1985; 1993; 1999; Koeneman 2001). This generalisation has however many well-known exceptions (Rohrbacher 1999; Wiklund et al. 2007) and has been rejected by various scholars (cf. e.g. Schifano 2015, 2018). The hypothesis would predict that non-finite forms do not move high, with the exception of *inflected* non-finite forms.

On the basis of the data presented in this chapter, we can conclude that verb movement does not seem to be triggered by inflection, or at least not exclusively. Non-finite/non-inflected forms move high anyway, arguably higher than inflected counterparts (cf. data Schifano 2018). Particularly revealing in this respect is the opposition between inflected and non-inflected infinitives in Sardinian:

(137) a. *Maria cheriat   a mandigare(n)   sempre (*mandigare(n)) bene*
Maria want.PST.3SG   to eat.INF(.3PL)   always eat.INF(.3PL)   well
(*mandigare(n)) sos   pizzinnos.
eat.INF(.3PL)   the boys
'Maria wanted the boys to always eat well.'
b. *Mannedda   cheriat   a mandigare(mus)   como (*mandigaremus).*
grandmother   want.PST.3SG   to eat.INF(.1.PL)   now   eat.INF(.1.PL)
'Grandmother would like us to eat now.'

(Srd.)

The absence or presence of overt agreement between the infinitival form and its subject does not seem to influence the position of the verb:[15] speakers prefer the adverbs to follow it either way. Furthermore, non-finite forms seem to raise consistently high into the HAS, apart from the exceptions of French and Romanian. It thus seems very unlikely that a verb moves only to pick up its inflection in Romance or to license its subject.

---

[15] The same conclusion is reached by Jones (1993:281), who argues that the realisation of the agreement is a purely PF phenomenon.

4.1.2   Tense

If richness or the presence of personal agreement endings is not responsible for the movement of non-finite verb forms, richness of Tense could maybe explain the cases, as has been proposed for finite forms (Biberauer & Roberts 2010).

The question arises whether a non-finite verb has a T-feature as well. The answer seems negative if we look at this from a purely morphological point of view. Syntactically, things might be different. It is generally assumed that some control infinitives do have independent tense, as they refer to an 'unrealised future' which can be demonstrated with future adverbs (Stowell 1982; Bošković 1997). Consider the following examples from Stowell (1982:563):

(138) a. Jenny remembered [PRO to bring the wine].
        b. Jenny remembered [PRO bringing the wine].
(139) a. Jim tried [PRO to lock the door].
        b. Jim tried [PRO locking the door].

The infinitival complements are interpreted as *unrealised* with respect to the tense of the matrix. In contrast, the understood tense of the gerund depends on the governing verb. This leads Stowell (1982: 563) to postulate a tense operator in the complementiser position, similar to finite tensed clauses. When the complementiser layer is absent, as is the case in ECM constructions, there is no such tense operator and the unrealised future reading does not result. The tense is determined by the meaning of the matrix verb.

Similarly, Wurmbrand (2007; 2014) argues that infinitives do not have absolute tense, only relative tense. The unrealised, future-interpretation is caused by the presence of a *woll*P for future infinitives (instead of in the C-domain, as argued by Stowell 1982). Infinitives are always realised in a future with respect to the matrix verb, not with respect to the time of the utterance. Tense is therefore not as strong as in finite tenses. However, there is no *woll*P present in the case of other controlled infinitives, such as complements to modals or 'claim', yielding a simultaneous interpretation (Wurmbrand 2014). If tense were the trigger for movement, we would expect this to be reflected in different movement patterns, contrary to fact. Instead, we find a general high movement pattern in Romance non-finite and less-finite forms.

Ambar (1994; 1999) and Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández (2017) have argued that Portuguese inflected infinitives (and Romance infinitives with specified subjects in general) have tense. Inflected infinitives in epistemic and declarative complements only allow for an iterative reading of the combination of *haver* 'have' and the past participle, which is impossible with finite clauses; they have to be generic in case of eventive predicates, otherwise only stative predicates can be

used. Similar lexical restrictions are found with Italian Aux-to-Comp complements (see discussion in §4.4 above). Rather than pure tense, this seems to relate to (lexical) aspect. Furthermore, although inflected infinitives allow quite free tense interpretations (cf. chapter 5§7.2), nevertheless it cannot explain the verb movement, as the movement to the C-domain is also found with other non-finite forms such as the gerund, which do not have the same temporal properties.

Often, the presence of a T-feature on C has been proposed as reason for movement to a high position in the Aux-to-Comp construction (Rizzi 1982, Raposo 1989). Tense in this case is not located on T but on C (cf. Ouali's (2008) SHARE, DONATE and KEEP options), due to defectiveness of non-finite forms. It is however not clear why this tense feature is only present on C in the case of complements to epistemic and declarative verbs. It also cannot explain the high movement in other non-finite contexts.

In any case, if this relative tense were the trigger of movement, we would expect differences between the Romance non-finite verb forms, as not all of them have an irrealis/future interpretation. Tense or tense oppositions are therefore to be discarded as the (sole) trigger of verb movement.

4.1.3 Mood

It has been argued that infinitives move to the highest relevant position in the I-domain, to license a [-realis] feature, just like subjunctives (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; 2014; Schifano 2018:230–239). Evidence for this claim comes from the fact that subjunctives in all Romance languages move high (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014:37; Schifano 2015:202–13; 2018). Unlike indicatives, subjunctives consistently target a high position across Romance:

(140) *Eu quero   que a   Maria leia   já   (*leia)   este livro*.
      I want.1SG   that the   Mary reads.SBJV.3SG already reads.SBVJ.3SG this book
      'I want Maria to read this book now .'

                                                                    (EuPt., Schifano 2018:98)

(141) *Joan vol   que   la seva dona prepare   sempre (*prepare)   les*
      Joan want.3SG that   the his wife prepare.SBJV.3SG always prepare.SBVJ.3SG the
      postres.
      desserts
      'Joan wants his wife to always prepare the desserts.'

                                                                    (VCat., Schifano 2018:100)

(142) *Je veux   que   le jardinier   coupe   généralement (*coupe)   les arbustes.*

I want.1SG   that   the gardener   cuts.SBJV.3SG   generally   cuts.SBJV.3SG the bushes

'I want the gardener to usually cut the bushes.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Schifano 2018:96)</div>

(143) *Ion vrea   ca   soția sa   să pregătească   întotdeauna (*#să pregătească)*

Ion want.3SG   that   wife his   SA prepare.SBJV.3SG   always   SA prepare.SBJV.3SG

desertul.

dessert.DET

'Ion wants his wife to always prepare the dessert.'

<div align="right">(Ro., Schifano 2018:273–4)</div>

The high movement described in this chapter thus mimics the movement of the subjunctive, and not that of indicative finite forms. The licensing of a [-realis] feature might therefore seem a logical trigger for movement of these cases.

However, not all non-finite forms have a [-realis] interpretation. As discussed above, we also find high verb movement of non-finite forms in other types of complements, such as complements to factive verbs and in realis complements selected by epistemic and declarative verbs, as well as gerunds and past participle clauses. If [-realis] were the trigger for high verb movement (in opposition with [+realis]), we would expect that the [realis] clauses, finite or non-finite, pattern similarly. This is not the case because gerunds, past participles and factive infinitival complements do not replicate Schifano (2018)'s findings for finite verb movement. Furthermore, factive verbs often license the subjunctive in many Romance varieties:

(144) a. *Mi dispiace   che si sia   ammalato.*

   to.me=displease.3SG that REFL=be.SBJV.3SG gotten.ill

   'I regret that he got ill.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

   b. *Je regrette   qu'elle   ne   veuille   pas   en parler   avec moi.*

   I regret.1SG that=she NEG   wants.SBJV.3SG NEG   of.it=talk.INF   with me

   'I regret that she does not want to talk about it with me.'

<div align="right">(Fr.)</div>

These complements are not [-realis], but nevertheless show high verb movement. The feature [-realis] thus cannot be the determining factor for high verb movement.

Instead, the similarities in verb movement between subjunctives and infinitives can be explained by the fact that both are indirectly anchored forms (see chapter 5§6 for discussion);

mood alone is not enough to explain the movement. Forms that are indirectly anchored but not [-realis], also move high. This shows that the relevant feature here is not [-realis], but rather [+indirect anchoring].

4.1.4   Anchoring

There must thus be a trigger for the high movement of less-finite and non-finite forms, which also applies to subjunctives. As will be extensively argued in chapter 5, both subjunctives and non-finite forms have in common that their anchoring for Tense and Person occurs indirectly (indeed, both can be considered 'less-finite' compared to indicative (main) clauses). I propose that this is the trigger for movement and that the locus of this anchoring is Fin (see chapter 5 for discussion). Non-finite verbs need to move to or very close to this position to receive the appropriate temporal and subject interpretation. Unlike direct anchoring, I assume that for indirect anchoring, the verb must move into a local checking domain with Fin. The idea will be further elaborated in the following chapter. Here it is crucial to establish that both subjunctives and non-finite forms move to a high position within the HAS or even to a lower CP position (viz. Fin), whereas finite (indicative) forms do not.

Given that this process of anchoring establishes a relation with the moment of speech and hence with the speaker, the oddness of the high adverbs, which are speaker-oriented, falls out automatically. The fact that these are odd in both subjunctives and non-finite clauses is because they are related to the speaker, which is only indirectly present in these clauses (cf. Giorgi 2010:72ff.).

4.2 Consequences for available subject positions

As argued above, the trigger for movement is the need for a non-finite or less-finite verb to enter into a local relation with Fin, where the indirect anchoring takes place. The verb needs to be 'visible'. This movement seems to make [spec,TP] unavailable in some cases, such as the personal infinitive, the Sardinian inflected infinitive, the Italian absolute participle and gerunds, where subjects occur preferably postverbally. As discussed in chapter 2, with the Balkan-style subjunctive the canonical subject position is also unavailable. A subject in this position would interfere in the anchoring process.

Considering the idea that subjunctive forms also feature indirect anchoring, we would predict that preverbal subjects are also excluded with subjunctives. This prediction is not borne out. It is only when the complementiser is dropped that the preverbal position is not allowed, and even in this case it is only for some speakers (for 50% more or less, Giorgi 2010: 67). In fact, examples (142-5) contain a preverbal subject preceding the high adverbs (presumably in SubjP).

In this case, the preverbal subject does not block the anchoring mechanism. I hypothesise here that the anchoring can be mediated by the complementiser *che*, which allows for the activation of the preverbal subject in [spec,TP] (or Spec,AgrsP in Cardinaletti's terms).

4.3 French infinitives

As seen in §3.3.1, movement of French infinitives is optional. The infinitive does not have to raise over any of the LAS adverbs, but can do so (although this is the marked order). However, in the case of high adverbs, the infinitive preferably precedes the adverbs. These are two conflicting results: LAS adverbs indicate low and optional movement; the HAS adverbs seem to show that French infinitives pattern like the Romance ones.

The split in position between HAS and LAS adverbs is confirmed by the study of a corpus of French prose. Engver (1972:chap. 3) finds 612 out of 6740 adverbs preceding the infinitive. Almost all these adverbs are located within the LAS. High adverbs such as *maintenant* 'now, *évidemment* 'evidently', *(mal)heureusement* '(un)fortunately', and *nécessairement* 'necessarily' never precede the infinitive in the corpus. For certain of these LAS adverbs, the preverbal position is much more frequent than the postverbal one, as can be seen in the following table (1972:chap. 3):

Table 4.11 Percentages of preverbal and postverbal adverbs in French (Engver 1972: 113)

Adverbs	Preverbal positions	Postverbal positions
Même	81 (95.3%)	4 (4.7%)
Trop	47 (85.5%)	8 (14.5%)
Toutefois	17 (85%)	3 (15%)
Mieux	99 (91.8%)	22 (18.2%)
Bien[16]	158 (80.6%)	38 (19.4%)

---

[16] There is a difference in meaning between preverbal *bien* and postverbal *bien*:

(i) a. *J'ai   fait   bien mes devoirs.*
        I=have.1SG done   well my homework
        'I have done my homework well.'
    b. *J'ai   bien   fait   mes devoirs.*
        I=have.1SG indeed   done   my homework
        'I have indeed done my homework.'

(Fr., Rowlett 2007:109)

(ii) a. *Il   a   décidé   de chanter bien.*
         he   have.3SG   decided   of sing.INF well
         'He has decided to sing well.'
     b. *Il   a   décidé   de bien   chanter.*

Jamais	45 (77.6%)	13 (22.4%)
Proprement	14 (70%)	6 (30%)
Autant	10 (62.5%)	6 (37.5%)
Plus	32 (61.5%)	19 (38.5%)
Toujours	20 (28.8%)	74 (71.2%)

Some of these cases can be explained. The first adverb is a focalising adverb, which is placed in front of the verb so that it takes scope of the verb phrase. It is surprising to see that the other adverbs that are very frequently placed postverbally are the lowest adverbs within the LAS, such as *mieux* 'better', *bien* 'well' and *trop* 'too much'. An adverb such as *toujours* 'always', which can also appear higher in the LAS, is much less frequently placed preverbally. The lower the adverb is located within Cinque's hierarchy, the more frequently it will appear preverbally.

If we combine more adverbs, the results are the following:

(145) a. *Il faut*   *mettre le réveil*   *pour (?se réveiller)*   *toujours*
it be.necessary.3SG   put.INF the alarm for   REFL=wake.up.INF always
(se réveiller)   *tôt*   *(*se réveiller).*
REFL=wake.up.INF early REFL=wake.up.INF
'It is necessary to set an alarm in order to always wake up early.'

    b. *(?Parler) toujours (?parler)*   *bien parler*   *de ses amis,*   *c'est*   *important.*
speak.INF always speak.INF   well speak.INF of his friends   it be.3SG important
'It is important to always speak nicely about your friends.'

    c. *(?Cuisiner)* *peut-être (*cuisiner)* *bien (*cuisiner), ça n'est*   *pas assez*   *pour*
cook.INF   maybe   cook.INF well cook.INF that NEG= be.3SG   NEG enough for
devenir   *un chef.*
become.INF a   chef
'To maybe cook well is not enough in order to become a chef.'

(Fr.)

With two low adverbs, as in (145a,b), one or both adverbs can follow the infinitive, which displays very low movement. Whenever we combine a low and a high adverb, such as *bien* 'well' and *peut-*

---

he have.3SG decided of well   sing.INF
He has decided he would indeed sing.'

(Fr., Rowlett 2007:109)

Affirmative *bien* is located in the same position as negative adverbs (Belletti 1990, 39ff. 1994b cited in Cinque 1999: 171 n.20).

être 'maybe' in (145c), the infinitive cannot follow both adverbs; the preferred order is the infinitive preceding both adverbs. This means that despite appearances, French has a high infinitive placement just like the other Romance languages. The low position of the infinitive in combination with LAS adverbs is thus only apparent, and the problem of how these LAS adverbs end up appearing preverbally will be left aside.

However, in the case of a high adverb such as *maintenant* 'now' combined with negation, which should occupy a lower position, we find the opposite order the negation seems to be located higher than *maintenant* 'now':

(146) ?*Il faudrait   ne (*parler)   pas parler   maintenant.*
       it be.necessary.COND.3SG   NEG speak.INF   NEG speak.INF   now
       'It would be necessary that we do not speak now.'

(Fr.)

If we assume, following Cinque (1999:121), that negation can be projected anywhere along the clausal spine, *ne pas* could be located within the CP or very high in the IP. Under this view, both the infinitive and the adverb could be in their canonical positions within the IP; it is only the negation that differs from other Romance languages (and its finite counterparts).

In conclusion, the French infinitive is thus not substantially different from other Romance languages; the only difference concerns the different placement of negation, and lower adverbs. What causes this different placement is a problem that will be left aside for further research due to space constraints.

5.   Conclusions: verb movement and finiteness

In this chapter, the movement of verb forms that are traditionally considered non-finite has been studied. The forms include the personal and inflected infinitive, bare infinitives in subject clauses, Aux-to-Comp infinitives, gerunds, past participles and the Romanian supine. The most important finding, which has not been noted explicitly before, is that the movement of non-finite verbs is thoroughly different from that which has been argued for finite verbs.

Secondly, the overall finding is that there is a commonality to the syntax of non-finite verbs despite a morphological difference: all target a high clausal position at the edge of IP close to CP. We thus find different movement patterns than with finite indicative forms; the pattern resembles more the high placement of the subjunctive. There is thus no difference in verb movement

between finite and non-finite forms in the traditional definition; subjunctives instead pattern with the infinitives, gerunds etc. in their high verb movement.

These conclusions have been reached by combining a series of diagnostics, focusing mostly on adverb placement as these gave the most consistent results. Foci, topics, and subjects generally confirmed the results. The position of clitics is a bit more problematic, which might indicate that the assumptions about their placement made in the beginning of this chapter need to be reviewed, an issue which will be left aside for future research.

French seems to pattern differently from the other Romance languages. With French, movement of the infinitive is apparently very low, as most LAS adverbs can precede the infinitive. With HAS adverbs, however, the only possible order is V+Adv, which shows us that French is not essentially different from other Romance languages and also shows V-movement with infinitives.

Finally, it has been argued that the movement to the highest positions within the HAS has consequences for the subject position in some Romance languages. [spec,TP] is not available: this is the case for the personal infinitive, the Sardinian inflected infinitive, the Balkan-style subjunctive, and the gerund. For anchoring to take place, the verb needs to move to Fin (as in Aux-to-Comp), or, whenever a complementiser is located in Fin, the verb needs to be its direct complement so that the verb and the anchoring head Fin can be in a local relationship. The movement to satisfy this requirement in case of indirect anchoring makes the canonical preverbal subject position unavailable.

5. Defining finiteness: the view from Romance

1. Introduction

As discussed extensively, there are several clause types in Romance which are not readily classifiable as either finite or non-finite. These include the personal and inflected infinitives, Balkan-style subjunctives and narrative infinitives. Although traditionally considered non-finite, the personal (1) and inflected infinitive (2) license a referential nominative subject, a syntactic hallmark of finiteness, and inflected infinitives even agree with their subject in person and number. Conversely, the Balkan-style subjunctive is a morphologically finite form which behaves as a non-finite form in that it occurs in contexts where complete coreference and simultaneity are required (3):

(1) ***Menjar*** *ara* ***nosaltres*** *no* *seria* *mala idea.*
     eat.INF   now we.NOM   NEG be.COND.3SG bad idea
     'It would not be a bad idea for us to eat now.'
<div align="right">(Cat.,Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:399)</div>

(2) *Será* *difícil* ***eles*** *aprova**rem*** *a proposta.*
     be.FUT.3SG difficult they.NOM approve.INF.3.PL the proposal
     'It will be difficult for them to accept the proposal'
<div align="right">(EuPt., Raposo 1987:86)</div>

(3) *Ana$_i$* *a* *început* *să* (e$_{*i/j}$) ***lucreze*** *(*mâine).*
     Ana   have.3SG started SA work.SBJV.3SG (tomorrow)
     'Ana has started to work.'
<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

These are just some examples of how Romance clauses can show properties of both finite and non-finite clauses, and therefore occupy an intermediate position between the two as 'semi-finite' forms.

     In this chapter, I will review previous approaches to the notion of finiteness, including typological, functional, and generative approaches. I will argue that finiteness is not a linguistic primitive, despite the proposal of functional projections like Rizzi's (1997) FinP, but instead should be related to the anchoring of the event to the utterance through both tense and person. The chapter is structured as follows: §2 will argue that finiteness has different meanings for the different levels of grammar. In §3, the view of finiteness as an opposition between N and V features will be rejected for Romance; §4 will critically review previous approaches to finiteness; finally,

§5 will set out the approach that will be followed here. §6 will discuss the relation between finiteness and mood; §7 applies the new analysis to the forms that have been called semi-finite in the previous chapters of this thesis. §8 discusses the relation between finiteness and clause size, and §9 concludes the chapter.

2. Reflexes of finiteness at different levels of grammar

A possible solution to the problems raised above, where finite forms appear in non-finite contexts and vice versa, could be to separate the notion of finiteness into different levels, namely morphological, syntactic and semantic finiteness (Ledgeway 2007; Sells 2007). This section will review the properties typically associated with (non-)finiteness for different levels of grammar.

2.1 Morphological finiteness

As already discussed in chapter 1, a purely morphological definition of finiteness is untenable. Morphological finiteness is a relative notion. Comparing forms occurring in main clauses with those typically appearing in embedded contexts, it can be noted that they vary with respect to certain morphological parameters, such as the absence or presence of person agreement and the absence or presence of TAM marking. Indeed, in Romance, mood and tense marking are absent from non-finite forms but present on finite or 'inflected' forms. This is however not necessarily the case cross-linguistically. For instance, Dravidian non-finite forms are marked for tense (Amritavalli 2014), as are many Japanese infinitives, apart from those in restructuring configurations (Wurmbrand 2001:85–91). Moreover, Latin infinitives are marked for imperfective vs perfective aspect (e.g. *cantare* 'to sing' vs *cantauisse* 'to have sung'). Thus, as Joseph (1983:6) also concludes in his discussion of the Balkan infinitive, there seems to be no single universally valid set of morphological parameters for defining finiteness for all natural languages. A morphological definition of finiteness will therefore only have descriptive, relative value within a language. Cross-linguistically, the parameters used to compare finite and non-finite forms are different, and some languages make no morphological distinction at all, as described in chapter 1.

Another indication that morphological cues are not a reliable indicator of finiteness is that morphological marking is readily susceptible to change or can be optional. The inflected infinitive in old Neapolitan and Sardinian illustrates this point very well. As shown by Ledgeway (2007:337–43; 2009a), the inflected infinitive (4a) is lost in the history of Neapolitan and replaced by the so-called personal infinitive (4b), which has the same syntactic properties (such as the

licensing of a nominative subject) but differs from the inflected infinitive in the lack of agreement endings on the infinitive.

(4)   a.   *Presto   speramo   a Dio   essere**no**   rutte.*
           soon   hope.1PL   to God   be.INF.3PL   routed
           'We hope to God that they will soon be routed.'

                                      (ONap., Ferraiolo 138v. 8–9 *apud* Ledgeway 2007:339)

    b.   *Meh,   Carmè,   serve   pe ce vedé   n'ata   vota.*
           come.on Carmela serve.3SG   for us=see.INF an=other time
           'Come on, Carmela, it'll allow us to see one another again.'

                                             (Nap., Ledgeway 2007:341)

The change in morphological finiteness is thus not reflected in other levels of the grammar; there seem to be no syntactic consequences of the loss of morphological inflection on the infinitive. Similarly, the morphological marking on the Sardinian inflected infinitive is entirely optional (Jones 1993:281), with no changes occurring in the syntactic or semantic finiteness of these forms when the inflection is omitted. The personal infinitive in Sardinian can also license nominative subjects and appears in exactly the same contexts:

(5)   *Mannedda   cheriat   a mandigare(mus)   como.*
       grandmother   want.IPFV.3SG to eat.INF.1PL   now
       'Grandmother would like us to eat now.'

                                                 (Nuorese Srd.)

Realisation of morphological agreement might thus be a purely phonological 'surface' phenomenon, as Jones (1993:281) proposes. Therefore, at least within Romance, morphological finiteness is not in any way indicative of syntactic or semantic finiteness.

Comparing finiteness between languages and within the history of a single language on purely morphological grounds is therefore of little use. In fact, in other areas of syntax too, morphological richness has proven an unreliable diagnostic for grammatical distinctions. For instance, it has traditionally been assumed that a rich verbal agreement paradigm correlates with verb movement (Roberts 1985; 1993; 1999; Vikner 1995; Koeneman 2001; Bobaljik 2002; Koeneman & Zeijlstra 2014), as well as with the availability of null subjects (Taraldsen 1980; Rizzi 1982:chap. IV). For both correlations exceptions are attested, such as Icelandic and Russian, which present rich agreement but no obligatory V-to-I verb movement (Bailyn 1995; Wiklund et al. 2007; Koeneman & Zeijlstra 2014:571); or, conversely, Brazilian Portuguese and French, which

have strongly reduced verbal paradigms but still present (albeit to different degrees) verb movement into the I-domain (Schifano 2015; 2018). Brazilian Portuguese allows null subjects and objects to some extent (Rodrigues 2002). Also, given the morphological richness of most Romance languages, differences in verb movement as described in Schifano (2018) are unexpected (see discussion in chapter 4).

The fact that these generalisations about the mapping between syntax and morphology all have exceptions, shows that morphological richness is not a reliable indication of the presence or absence of syntactic or semantic features; there seems to be no one-to-one mapping between syntactic and semantic features and morphological spell-out. As Bobaljik puts it, "syntactic variation is attested in the absence of morphological variation" (Bobaljik 2002:160). A purely morphological definition of finiteness in terms of the presence or absence of certain verbal features should therefore be rejected. Rather, we need to make a distinction between morphological finiteness and finiteness at other levels of grammar (Anderson 2002:273; Ledgeway 2007:343).

2.2 Syntactic finiteness

From a syntactic viewpoint, finiteness relates more to the properties of the clause a verb appears in than the verb form itself. There are many mismatches between syntactic properties correlated with finiteness and the morphological definition of finiteness. For example, as seen in chapter 1, a form is often considered finite when it can head a matrix clause, or more specifically, a declarative root clause (Cristofaro 2003; Anderson 2007). Non-finite forms such as infinitives can appear in some root contexts, as in questions, 'narrative infinitives' (Nikolaeva 2010:1178) and child language (Wexler 1994; Lasser 2002):

(6) *Cosa fare*?
     what do.INF
     'What to do?'

                                                                            (It.)

(7) *Marie est   venue et   Jean de   partir.*
     Marie be.3SG   come and   Jean of   leave.INF
     'Marie has come and Jean has left.'

                                                             (Fr., Nikolaeva 2007:153)

(8) *Graucus   primo distinguere   et   dividere,   quemadmodum   illa*
     Graucus.NOM   first distinguish.INF and   divide.INF,   as   those.ACC.PL

dicerentur.

say.PASS.IMPF.SBJV.3.PL

'First Graucus distinguished them and divided them, in the way they were told.'

<div align="right">(Lat., Nikolaeva 2007:154)</div>

(9) *Michel   dormir   là*

Michel   sleep.INF there

'Michel sleeps there.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Wexler 1994:311)</div>

Nikolaeva (2007:153ff.) shows that the sentences in (8-9) are finite as they have a regular nominative subject which can control into adjuncts, bind reflexives and can participate in passivisation, like any other subject. In the Latin example in (8) the infinitive has a deictic past tense reference, as can be deduced from the imperfect subjunctive *dicerentur* in the example. The French narrative infinitive in (7) on the other hand has a relative tense which is interpreted as posterior to the verb heading the first conjunct.

Conversely, some morphologically finite forms rarely head their own matrix clause, such as subjunctives. Subjunctives could then be considered less finite even though, morphologically, they are finite, bearing tense[1] and agreement marking (cf. Vincent 1998 and the discussion below in §5.1). These forms can occasionally appear in matrix clauses, but when they do, the clause usually marks a specific modality. For instance, when subjunctives are used in a matrix clause, the clause expresses a command, wish, or curse:

(10) *Viva   l'Italia!*

live.SBJV.3.SG   the=Italy

'Long live Italy!'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

This highlights how we need to distinguish morphological finiteness and the ability to head a matrix clause.

Another property that has been linked to syntactic finiteness is the ability to license overt nominative subjects (Chomsky 1981:50; 1998:39). Non-finite forms on the other hand cannot and their subject is interpreted as arbitrary (PRO_arb) or as coreferential with a matrix argument (raising and control). Also in this case there are mismatches with morphological finiteness. As has been described in chapter 4 and the Introduction of this chapter, many non-finite forms in

---

[1] But see below for discussion on whether this should be regarded as tense marking.

Romance license nominative subjects, not only infinitives (11), but also gerunds (12), and participles (13):

(11) *Al   cantarlo tú,   empezó   la fiesta.*
     at.the sing.INF=it you, start.PRET.3SG the party
     'Upon your singing it, the party began.'

<div align="right">(Sp., Zagona 2002:28)</div>

(12) *Essendo Gianni   disposto ad aiutarci, …*
     be.GER   Gianni   willing   to help.INF=us
     'Gianni being willing to help us, …'

<div align="right">(It., Rizzi 1982:83)</div>

(13) *Chegados   os convidados, podemos server   a sopa.*
     arrived.PTC the invited   can.1PL serve.INF   the soup
     'Once the guests have arrived, we can serve the soup.'

<div align="right">(BrPt., Schmitt 1998:287)</div>

Conversely, there are verb forms that are morphologically finite whose subject raises to the subject position of a restructuring verb, such as the Balkan-style subjunctive (14):

(14) *Ion ştie   (*Ion/*el/*Radu/EL) să vorbească   (*Ion/*el/Radu/EL)   engleza.*[2]
     Ion know.3SG   Ion/he/Radu/HE   SA speak.SBJV.3SG Ion/he/Radu/he   English.DET
      'Ion is able to speak English.' (*Ion knows he/Radu speaks English).

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

(15) *Gianni sa   parlare   l'inglese   (* Gianni/*lui/*Roberto).*
     Gianni know.3SG   speak.INF   the=English   Gianni/he/Roberto
     'Gianni is able to speak English.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

No subject can be inserted in the embedded clause in (14), whether it is coreferent with the matrix subject or not, exactly like the Italian restructuring example in (15). The embedded subjunctive verb does not license nominative case, despite the finite morphology on the verb.

---

[2] Only a focused (coreferential) pronoun is allowed here.

Syntactic finiteness is often informally related to the presence of tense: finite forms appearing in matrix clauses have Tense whereas non-finite forms do not. However, it has been argued that not all infinitives are tenseless: control infinitives have a future, unrealised tense (Stowell 1982; Bošković 1997), which is interpreted relative to the matrix clause tense. Other infinitives, such as those of raising and ECM complements, are interpreted as simultaneous to the matrix clause event. These tense interpretations are however not deictic, unlike morphologically finite verbs which usually license a deictic tense (with the exception of subjunctives, see below):

(16) *Tre   mesi   fa   avevo   deciso   di licenziarmi   ieri.*
     three months ago   have.IPFV.1SG   decided of quit.job.INF=REFL yesterday
     'I decided three months ago to quit my job yesterday.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

The unrealised 'future' interpretation of the complement of *decidere* 'to decide' is interpreted with respect to the main verb, and not the moment of speech, as is shown by the grammaticality of a past adverb such as *ieri* 'yesterday'.

Syntactic ways of marking finiteness in Romance include selecting different complementisers; *che/que* for finite clauses (17a, 18a), AD/DE for non-finite clauses (17b, 18b):

(17) a. *Jean dit   **que/*à/*de**   Marie ne   va   plus   à Paris.*
        Jean say.3SG that/to/of   Marie NEG   go.3SG   anymore to Paris
        'Jean says that Marie does not go to Paris anymore.'
     b. *Jean se refuse   ***que/de/à** aller   à Paris.*
        Jean REFL=refuse.3SG that/of/to go.INF   to Paris
        'Jean refuses to go to Paris.'

<div align="right">(Fr.)</div>

(18) a. *Io crerə   **ca/*e/*a**   tu   nun   stai   buonə.*
        I believe.1SG   that/of/to you.SG   NEG   stay.2SG good
        'I believe you are mad.'
     b. *Aierə   aggiu   decisə   ***ca/*a/e** ì   a Nnapələ rimanə.*
        yesterday   have.1SG   decided that/to/of go.INF   to Naples   tomorrow
        'Yesterday I decided to go to Naples tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(USIDs, Airola (BN))</div>

There is also a difference in verb-movement, as shown in chapter 4: non-finite forms move higher (cf. Kayne 1991; Schifano 2018):

(19) a. *A Maria   (*sabe)   já   sabe   esta   história.*
the Mary   (know.3SG) already   know.3SG   this   story
'Mary already knows this story.'

b. *Submeter   já   (*submeter)   a tua   tese   seria   um erro.*
submit.INF   already submit.INF   the your dissertation be.COND.3SG a   mistake
'It would be a mistake to submit your dissertation now.'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Schifano 2018:69, 94)</div>

(20) a. *Durant   les   classes d'història, Joan   (dorm)   sempre dorm.*
during   the   classes of history Joan   sleep.3SG   always sleep.3SG
'During the history classes, Joan always sleeps.'

b. *Eixir   sempre (*eixir)   el dissabte   per la nit   és   tipic   dels*
go.out.INF   always   (go.out.INF) the Saturday   by the night be.3SG   typical   of.the
joven.
young
'It is typical of young people to always go out on Saturday night.'

<div align="right">(VCat., Schifano 2018:68, 94)</div>

As can be seen in these European Portuguese and Valencian Catalan minimal pairs, the infinitives obligatorily move across adverbs which cannot or do not have to be crossed in case of a finite verb.

Another syntactic property that depends on finiteness is the opacity or otherwise of a clause (Nikolaeva 2010; Todorović & Wurmbrand 2016). A non-finite clause is a transparent domain for long-distance dependencies, such as clitic climbing (21) and negative raising (22):

(21) a. *(*El) vull   que   el vegis.*
him= want.1SG that   him=see.SBJV.2SG
'I want you to see him.'

b. *(El) vull   veure('l).*
him= want.1SG see.INF=him
'I want to see him.'

<div align="right">(Cat.)</div>

(22) a. *(*Non)   dico   che (non)   offendi   nessuno.*
not   say.1SG   that NEG   offend.2SG   nobody

'I say that you do not offend anybody.'

b. *Non   voglio   offendere   nessuno.*

NEG   want.1SG   offend.INF   nobody

'I do not want to offend anybody.'

(It.)

The transparency/opacity of a subordinate clause is often connected to the presence or absence of the C-domain. Non-finite clauses are taken to lack or have a reduced C-domain. This is illustrated by the following examples from Spanish, where topicalisation and focus fronting is not allowed in non-finite complements:

(23) a. *Luis   dice   que,   los libros,   ya   los leyó.*

Luis   say.3SG   that   the books   already   them=read.PRET.3.SG

'Luis says that the books, he already read.

b. *Luis   dice   que   CERVEZA   ha   bebido   (y   no   sidra).*

Luis   say.3SG   that   beer   have.3SG   drunk   and   NEG   cider

'Luis says that beer he has drunk (and not cider).'

(Sp., Gallego 2010:146)

(24) a. ??*Luis   quiere,   los libros,   leerlos.*

Luis   want.3SG   the books   read.INF=them

'The books, Louis wants to read them.'

b. **Luis quiere,   CERVEZA   beber   (y   no   sidra).*

Luis   want.3SG   beer   drink.INF   and   NEG   cider

'Luis wants to drink beer (and not cider).'

(Sp., Gallego 2010:147)

However, rather than the traditional finite/non-finite distinction, what is crucial here is the distinction between restructuring vs non-restructuring verbs (Rizzi 1976a; 1976b; 1978; Cinque 2004; 2006). Not all infinitives in Romance allow clitic climbing or negative raising:

(25) *(*El) vaig   rebutjar   veure('l).*

it=go.1SG   refuse.INF   see.INF=it

'I refused to see it.'

(Cat.)

(26) *(*Non)   decido   di (non)   mangiare   niente.*

| not | decide1SG | of | NEG | eat.INF | anything |

'I decide not to eat anything.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

A small group of modal and aspectual verbs form what has traditionally been described as a verbal complex. Cinque (2004; 2006) convincingly shows that these actually instantiate monoclausal structures where the finite verb is a functional verb, directly inserted into an FP in the I-domain, whereas the infinitive is the lexical verb located lower, within the VP. Rather than two clauses becoming one (clause union/restructuring), the sentence is monoclausal from the start; the subject of the lexical verb is raised to the IP. Restructuring predicates are thus mere raising predicates which are directly merged in a functional head.

Conversely, some of these dependencies apparently depending on the finiteness of the complement are also allowed into clauses which are traditionally considered finite, such as subjunctive clauses (see §6.1). So again, there is a mismatch between a syntactic property associated with finiteness, viz. opacity, and the morphological marking on the verb heading the embedded clause.

Another fact confirming that what is at play is the restructuring vs full complement distinction comes from the fact that the left periphery can be activated in other types of infinitival complements:

(27) a. *Espero,   los resultados, tenerlos   el lunes.*
         hope.1SG   the results   have.INF=them the Monday
         'The results, I hope to have them by Monday.'

     b. *Dudaba,   el cordero, si hacerlo   al horno.*
         doubt.IPFV.3SG the lamb   if make.INF=it   at.the oven
         'He doubted whether to cook the lamb in the oven.'

<div align="right">(Sp., Fernández-Sánchez 2016:116)</div>

Again, what is relevant for the grammaticality of discourse related phenomena is not the finiteness distinction but rather the size of the complement – whether the left periphery of the CP is available or not. It is not in the case of restructuring verbs such as *querer* 'to want'.

In conclusion, there are various instances of mismatches in Romance between morphologically finite forms and syntactic properties that have been associated with finiteness. We need to make a distinction between finiteness at a morphological and a syntactic level; the morphological notion of finiteness is of no cross-linguistic consequence and can only be used within languages. Another property that is relevant to explain certain phenomena typically associated with non-finite forms is the size of the complement (Sheehan & Cyrino to appear);

reduced (restructured) complements may allow or disallow operations, but this is not so much due to finiteness as much as the size of the clause (cf. chapter 2 and §8).

2.3 Semantic finiteness

From a semantic viewpoint, finiteness has to do with the independence of an event, whether it is autonomous or connected to another event (cf. Givón's (1990) event integration in §4.1 below). Unlike finite clauses, non-finite clauses do not always constitute an event of their own, cf. (28):

(28) *Inizio   a   scrivere.*
      begin.1SG   to write.INF
      'I begin to write.'

                                                                                          (It.)

It has also been argued that finiteness is related to assertion; only finite clauses have an assertive value. Klein (1998; 2006) argues for this view, applying the 'contrastive intonation test' on a finite element that bears no descriptive value, such as a copula:

(29) The book WAS on the table.

The particular contrast indicated by the intonation pattern can be interpreted in two ways: the book was on the table, but is not anymore; or, the assertion is wrong, and the book has never been on the table. The finite verb carries (at least) two distinct meaning components: tense and marking that an assertion is made with respect to whatever is said. According to Klein (1998; 2006), being the carrier of the element AST (for "assertion") is the main function of finiteness. In his view, finiteness is a category on its own and cannot be derived from the fact that finite forms are marked for tense, person, mood or other verbal categories. He breaks down the semantic contribution of a finite verb into tense and assertion, arguing that finiteness is a necessary condition for the latter.

There are several semantic effects of finiteness, which Klein views as an operator that can take scope. One of them is that "indefinite noun phrases have a specific reading only if they are (directly or indirectly) in the scope of a finite verb" (Klein 2006:257). If we take an indefinite object, such as 'a unicorn', we see that in the scope of a non-finite verb[3], it can have both a specific

---

[3] The effect can only be seen with so-called transparent verbs such as 'to find'. With opaque verbs as 'to seek' the object can have both a specific and non-specific reading even with finite verbs (Klein 2006: 256-7):

and non-specific reading. However, when selected by or embedded under a finite verb, the non-specific reading disappears:

(30) a. Finding a unicorn - what a bizarre idea!

b. It is the dream of each hunter to find a unicorn.

(Klein 2006:257)

(31) a. John found a unicorn.

b. John managed to find a unicorn.

(Klein 2006:257)

This shows that finiteness is more than just a morphological distinction, and has consequences at a semantic level as well. It seems however that it is not just finiteness that is playing a role here, but also mood. When selected by a finite verb such as 'to wish' or a modal, the non-specific reading is available again:

(32) a. John has to find a unicorn.

b. John wishes to find a unicorn.

This shows that finiteness is closely connected to mood, an idea that will be further explored in §6.

A problem for this view, as already indicated by Klein (2006:263ff.) himself, is that not all morphologically finite clauses are assertive (Hooper & Thompson 1973; Haegeman 2003; 2007; 2010). Questions, commands and wishes or general descriptions ('laws') are not. Also embedded sentences are not asserted, at least not by the speaker of the utterance as a whole; they could be the assertion of the main clause subject (e.g. complements to Hooper & Thompson's (1973) class A verbs, such as 'say', 'report', cf. (33)). Embedded finite sentences can also be presupposed rather than asserted, as in case of a factive verb (as in (34), cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1968; Hooper & Thompson 1973):

(33) *Gianni ha   detto che   la   terra è   piatta.*
      Gianni have.3SG   said   that the   Earth be.3SG flat
      'Gianni has said that the Earth is flat.'

(It.)

(i) John sought a unicorn.

(34) *Mi dispiace   che   piova   oggi.*
      to.me=displease.3SG that rain.SBJV.3SG today
      'I am sorry it rains today.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

The speaker is only asserting the matrix verb, not the complement, even if the verbs are morphologically finite. Other morphologically finite forms, such as the subjunctive, are not assertive, not even when used in a matrix clause. This is another hint that assertion and finiteness are indeed related, and that (non-)finiteness is closely related to mood.

According to Klein (2006:256), rather than expressing assertion directly, finiteness is required for assertion; finiteness links the non-finite sentence base to a topic component (including topic time, place and world); it links the topic about which something is asserted (wished, questioned...) to the assertion (or question, wish, command...). So, rather than expressing the assertion itself, it provides the link between the topic and the content of the sentence (see our discussion on anchoring below in §4).

2.4 Phonological (reflexes of) finiteness

The question arises whether there are phonological reflexes of finiteness; whether the finite/non-finite distinction is also marked in some way at the phonological level. There are indeed a few examples of how phonological features mark the distinction between finite and non-finite forms in Romance. In many southern Italian dialects, the difference between the 3rd person singular and the infinitive is marked mainly by stress (Ledgeway 2007), as in (35):

(35) a. [ak.kat.'ta]
          buy.INF
      b. [ak.'kat.ta]
          he.buys.PRS.IND

<div align="right">(SIDs, Moiano (BN))</div>

Nevertheless, the unstressed final [a] tends to be reduced to a schwa [ə], which further distinguishes the finite and non-finite form.

Similarly, the level of finiteness of a complement can be marked phonologically on the complementiser. In Cosentino, *Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico* on complementisers distinguishes between coreference [+RF] and obviation [-RF] of the embedded subject, and marks therefore the level of semantic integration between the two clauses (Ledgeway in press):

(36) a. *Francu$_i$ dicia   **cca** pro$_{i/??j}$ / ?Pinu tena   raggiune.*

        Francu   say.3SG   that   Pinu   have.3SG reason

        'Franco$_i$ says that he$_{i/??j}$ / ?Pinu is right.'

    b. *Francu$_i$ dicia   **ca**   pro$_{j/*i}$ / Pinu tena   raggiune.*

        Francu   say.3SG   that   Pinu   have.3SG reason

        'Franco$_i$ says that he$_{j/*i}$ / Pinu is right.'

<div align="right">(Cos., Ledgeway in press)</div>

If we assume a scalar view of finiteness, we can say that the presence of RF on the complementiser *cca* marks a less finite complement (namely a controlled complement, as in (36a)) than the absence of RF (*ca*), which indicates an obviative complement as in (36b).

Another example of phonology marking finiteness is given by the Sardinian and old Neapolitan inflected infinitive. The Sardinian inflected infinitive arguably derives from the imperfect subjunctive, with which it is still homophonous in many varieties, although the use of the imperfect subjunctive is limited to the auxiliaries *aere* 'have' and *esser* 'be'. During this reanalysis of the imperfect subjunctive as an inflected infinitive in Sardinian, there was a change in stress pattern (Jones 1993:278; Pisano 2008). In some of the varieties where both forms are still in use, the only difference between the two forms is the stress pattern; phonology marks a difference in the level of finiteness. Similarly, in old Neapolitan we see stress retraction in the reanalysis of pluperfect indicatives to inflected infinitives (Ledgeway 2007:358):

(37) CANTA(VE)RÀMUS   > *cantàremo*

     sing.PPRF.1PL   > sing.INF.1PL

     CANTA(VE)RA(TIS)=VOS   > *cantàrevo*

     sing.PPRF.2PL   > sing.INF.2PL

     CANTA(VE)RAN(T)   > *cantàreno*

     sing.PPRF.3PL   > sing.INF.3PL

The stress moves from the person ending to the infinitival inflection -*are*. The changes in stress patterns mark the change in finiteness both in Sardinian and old Neapolitan; in some Sardinian varieties both forms (infinitive and past subjunctives) are still used and are distinguished through stress.

All these examples show how (morpho-)phonology can mark finiteness on the complementiser or the verb. However, finiteness is not a phonological phenomenon but rather a syntactic-semantic distinction which can be reflected in (morpho)phonological marking.

2.5 Conclusion

Finiteness has different manifestations at various levels of grammar: morphologically, finiteness cannot be defined cross-linguistically, but non-finite forms often lack marking that is present on finite forms. Syntactically, finiteness manifests itself in the presence of an overt, lexical subject, in independent tense and in the opacity of the clause. Semantically, a finite clause is autonomous and expresses an assertion (or another illocutionary force). It has been shown that there are many mismatches between these levels, in the sense that morphological marking is not a reliable indicator of syntactic or semantic finiteness. A purely morphological definition therefore needs to be rejected. Also, since clauses can be non-finite on different levels of grammar, an overall binary view of finiteness is untenable, and a scalar view is more appropriate.

The remainder of this chapter will focus on the syntactic (and to some extent, semantic) properties of finiteness. It will be shown that it is not a linguistic primitive but is the result of the anchoring of a clause on a syntactic level, which strongly correlates with semantic autonomy. Morphological or phonological marking will not play a central role in the proposed analysis.

3. V-features vs N-features

Many linguistic theories recognise a major categorial distinction between verbs and nouns; other categories are sometimes derived as combinations of both verbal features (V) and nominal features (N) (cf. Chomsky 1981). Finite verbs are prototypically verbal, but non-finite verbs have a less clear status. Non-finite forms also present properties of other categories, especially nominal ones (Noonan 2007:69–71; Nikolaeva 2010:1177). Infinitives can behave as nouns, preceded by an article, as (38), and occurring in Case-marked argument positions; participles can behave as adjectives, agreeing with a noun (39); and gerunds are very similar to adverbials (40):

(38) *Il   dolce far   niente*
      the   sweet do.INF   nothing
      'Pleasant idleness'

(It.)

(39) *Le   materie   studiate*
      the   subjects.F.PL   studied.F.PL
      'The studied subjects'

(It.)

(40) *È   uscito   correndo.*
     be.3SG   gone.out   running
     'He came out running.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

It seems that only non-finite forms can be used as another category; finite verbs cannot normally be nominalised or be used as an adjective in Romance. There are, however, a few lexicalised cases: e.g. Fr. *le que-dit-on* 'gossip', It. *il come-si-chiama* 'the what's-it-called', *fu* 'deceased'.

In Romanian, the infinitive has different forms according to its use as a verbal or nominal category. There is a bare verbal form (41a), a verbal form with *a* (41b) and a nominal long form of the infinitive (41c):

(41) a. *mânca*
          eat.INF
      b. *a mânca*
          to eat.INF
      c. *mâncare(a)*
          eat.INF.N.(.DET)

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

The latter infinitive form is fully nominal, as it can be inflected for number and case (e.g. *mâncăruri* 'foods.NOM-ACC') and cannot head its own clause.

In fact, some typologists consider less finite forms 'deverbalised' and/or 'nominalised' (Croft 1990:217; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993; cf. discussion in §4.1 below). In many languages, the infinitive seems in fact to be derived from a nominal construction. This appears to be the case for most Indo-European infinitives, which derive historically from case-marked nominalisations (Noonan 2007:69). Many languages lack an 'infinitive' and show other types of non-finite forms (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993); the term 'infinitive' stems from the Indo-European tradition (cf. chapter 1).

Due to the nominal origin of infinitives, complementisers with infinitives typically derive from adpositions or articles, often expressing allative or purpose-related meanings, e.g. Eng. *to*, German *zu* and Romance AD > *a, à* (Haspelmath 1989). Similarly, we have prepositional non-finite complementisers derived from DE for infinitives and IN with gerunds. Finite complementisers, however, also often contain a nominal element; the same has been proposed for Romance *che/que* (Baunaz & Lander 2018).

However, the forms studied in the previous chapters in this thesis, such as the personal and inflected infinitive, or the Balkan-style subjunctive, are no more nominal than finite verb forms. They can appear in subject and object positions, and as complements, but so can embedded finite clauses headed by a complementiser *que/che*. They license subjects and objects, without needing a preposition as nominal forms do (cf. *la distruzione **della** città* 'the destruction **of** the city', *l'amore **di** una madre* 'the love **of** a mother') and are modified by adverbs rather than adjectives. The only seemingly more nominal behaviour of inflected infinitives is that they can sometimes be introduced by an article in case of factive complements:

(42) *M'aggradat   (**su**) de l'aereis   fattu bois   custu travallu.*
     to.me=please.3SG (the) of it=have.INF.2PL done you.PL   this   work
     'I like that you have done this job.'

(Srd., Virdis 2015:475)

(43) *Nós lamentamos   (**o** (facto de))   eles   terem   recebido pouco   dinheiro.*
     we regret.1PL   the fact of   they   have.INF.3PL   received little   money
     'We regret that they have received little money.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:97)

This can be explained under an approach of factive complements being nominal or referential (Haegeman & Ürögdi 2010a; 2010b), containing a silent noun 'fact' (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1968), which can indeed be realised in the Portuguese example. In sum, the view of non-finite forms as more nominal is not fine-grained enough to account for the semi-finite forms as attested in Romance.

4. Previous approaches

4.1 Typological/functionalist approaches

Typological approaches take finiteness as a cluster of features that set apart forms that appear in declarative main clauses from forms that are in some way reduced and tend to appear in subordinate clauses. Rather than defining it in an absolute way, there are prototypes of finite clauses and prototypes of non-finite clauses; they thus adopt a scalar notion of finiteness ("matter of degree" (Givón 1990:26)). The properties which disappear or change on less-finite verbs vary from language to language, which makes a cross-linguistic definition extremely difficult.

Cristofaro (2003) takes this a step further by saying that finiteness is essentially an epiphenomenon and is not part of speakers' linguistic knowledge. Rather than as a linguistic primitive, finiteness should be seen as 'the realisation of a cross-linguistic tendency for certain parameters to correlate with each other, motivated in terms of functional properties' (Nikolaeva 2010:1080).

This notion of finiteness might not be relevant for all languages, however. Typologists make a distinction between nominalising vs extreme finite languages (Givón 1990:26) or deranking vs balancing languages (Stassen 1985:76–81; Croft 1990:217–18; Cristofaro 2003:54ff). In the first type, viz. nominalising/deranking, certain verb forms become less prototypically verbal, which can happen through the loss of verbal properties (such as the loss of TAM and person marking, or employing special forms) and/or the acquisition of nominal properties (such as case marking), as in Tamil (44). In the other type, such a distinction is not made: all embedded clauses are as finite as matrix clauses (and are thus extreme finite/balanced), e.g. in Tolowa Athabaskan (45).

(44) *Ava   vizzuntatunaale   azutaa.*
      she   fall.PAST.NMLZ.INS   weep.PST.3.F.SG
      'Because she fell, she cried.'

                                                (Tamil, Cristofaro 2003:56)

(45) a. *nn-tū̄-sh-'į́*
         2.SG-THM-1.SG-observe
         'I observe you'
    b. *nn-tū̄-sh-'į́*   *'-uu-sh-tł -te*
         2.SG-THM-1.SG-observe   THM-DES-1SG-L-want
         'I want to observe you'

                            (Tolowa Athabaskan, Givón 1990:29–30)

The notion of finiteness thus cannot be a linguistic primitive as such if it does not have a value cross-linguistically.

Noonan (2007:67) considers infinitives to be 'verb-like entities that do not bear syntactic relations to their notional subjects, i.e. their subjects do not take nominative case marking or condition verb agreement (where otherwise appropriate for subjects), nor are they marked in the genitive case, as a subject of a nominalisation might be marked.' This definition is problematic because it would exclude the Romance inflected and personal infinitive, as well as the Balkan-style subjunctive, which we have argued are less finite than indicative verbs. Furthermore, his statement that infinitives are usually reduced in some way, but that 'except for subject agreement

(and mood), infinitives may be inflected for all verbal categories such as tense–aspect, voice, object agreement, etc.' (Noonan 2007:67), shows once more that from a cross-linguistic viewpoint a purely morphological definition of non-finite forms is impossible.

Cristofaro (2007:99) argues however that which features are lost when the verbal form is reduced are not completely random – there is a cross-linguistic tendency to lose certain verbal features before others, which she represents in the following hierarchy:

(46) Lack of T/A/M distinctions >> Lack of person agreement distinctions/lack of overtly expressed arguments >> Case marking/ adpositions, special T/A/M forms >> Special person agreement forms, coding of arguments as possessors.

'>>' has to be read as is 'more frequent than'. This seems to be partly confirmed by Romance non-finite forms, which lack T and M marking. Unlike Latin infinitives, they cannot be marked for aspect morphologically, only syntactically, namely by a periphrasis with a perfective auxiliary and a participle. Romance non-finite forms can optionally be marked for person or take an overt subject. With respect to case-marking, there seems to be an asymmetry between nominative and accusative, in the sense that many (but not all) non-finite forms lack the ability to assign nominative but are able to assign accusative:

(47) *Nel   considerare (*di) questi casi*,
    in.the consider.INF (*of) these cases
    'Considering these cases, …'

    (It.)

(48) *Studiando   (*di)   una   nuova lingua*,
    study.GER   (of)   a   new   language
    'Studying a new language, …'

    (It.)

In order to accommodate this, the hierarchy should be adapted and should distinguish the ability of a verb form to assign case to its subject from its ability to assign case to its object. Romance non-finite forms are indeed reduced for TAM distinctions, and many show no subject agreement and lack the ability to assign nominative case; nevertheless, many of them can still license a direct object.

4.1.1 Finiteness and subordination

Much typological and functional research has focused on a possible link between semantics (the type of bond between matrix and embedded clause) and the syntactic form of the subordination (finite vs non-finite complement).

According to Givón (1990) clause union is an iconic reflection of the cognitive-semantic process of event integration. There is isomorphism between the syntax and semantics of complementation, which involves the two parallel dimensions of event integration at a semantic level and clause integration/clause union at a syntactic level. The grammar of complementation is iconic because the more semantically integrated the two events are, the more the two clauses will be syntactically integrated as well. The syntactic devices to encode clause-union include: colexicalisation/predicate raising; case-marking and grammatical relations; the embedded subject being marked as an object of the main verb; change in the verbal morphology (reduced TAM and person marking, and a derived nominal form of the verb) and the presence or absence of an interclausal gap in the form of an intonation break or complementisers. This process can indeed be seen in Romance restructuring verbs and causative constructions:

(49) *Ci sono   dovuta   andare.*
     LOC=be.1SG must.PTC.F.SG go.INF
     'I had to go there.'

         (It.)

(50) *L'ha   fatto ridere.*
     him.ACC=have.3SG made laugh.INF
     'It has made him laugh.'

         (It.)

(51) *(*ci) ho/   *sono deciso/*a   di andarci.*
     LOC=have.1SG/ be.1SG decided.M.SG/F.SG to go.INF=LOC
     'I decided to go there.'

         (It.)

In the case of restructuring verbs, to which both *dovere* 'must' in (49) and causative *fare* 'do, make' (50) belong, the two verbs form one syntactic complex to which the clitics can appear in proclisis and where the matrix verb determines the perfective auxiliary of the modal; moreover, the subject of the causative verb is marked in accusative (Sheehan 2016:986–7). The verb lexicalising the embedded event is non-finite, in these cases an infinitive, and does not have any TAM or person

marking. On the other hand, such restructuring phenomena are not found with other verbs (51). Thus, the more the event is integrated, the less finite the complement will be.

Based on this iconicity principle, Givón (1990:59) proposes a complementation scale of event integration, from maximal to minimal event integration:

(52) [manipulative verbs: successful intended causation - intended active attempted manipulation] OR

[modality verbs: accomplishment – attempt – intent/obligation – preference/fear - ability/know how]

preference/aversion - epistemic anxiety - epistemic (un)certainty - indirected quoted utterance - directed quoted utterance

In a very similar vein, Cristofaro (2003:4) proposes the following subordination deranking hierarchy, also incorporating other subordination contexts apart from complementation:

(53) phasals > modals > desideratives, manipulatives, purpose > perception > before, after, when, A relativisation, S relativisation > reality condition, reason, O relativisation > knowledge, propositional attitude, utterance, IO relativisation, oblique relativisation

Assuming the iconicity idea of event integration, events occurring to the left side of the complementation will be likely to be encoded by a deranked verbal form, and the ones on the right will be encoded by more finite clauses. Cristofaro (2003:4) says "if any non-independent declarative clause-like construction is used to code the dependent event in a subordination relation at any point on the hierarchy, then it is used for all subordination relations to the left of the hierarchy." Nikolaeva (2010:1185) also describes a similarly consistent cross-linguistic picture where complements of cognitive predicates are canonically more finite than complements of volitional and some other predicates. According to her, this is because the former introduce an independent world (existential temporal anchoring) and the latter introduce a set of worlds (intensional anchoring).

These scales have also been adopted within a generative approach. Wurmbrand & Lohninger (submitted) argue that typically three complement types are distinguished in a language, and thus formulate a more general implicational complementation hierarchy: Attitude > Irrealis > Tenseless. The complements to attitude verbs are the most independent, least transparent, least integrated and most complex; the tenseless complements on the other hand are the least independent, the most transparent, the most integrated and the least complex.

A problematic aspect of these hierarchies is that many points present options in Romance. Many verbs can select both a subjunctive and an infinitival complement, which do not display the same degree of finiteness (nor the same reduction in verbal features). The distribution of these two is determined by whether the subject of the embedded clause is coreferent with an argument (usually the subject) of the matrix clause or not. In controlled complements, an infinitive will normally be used;[4] on the other hand, a subjunctive marks obviation in most Romance languages (the exception being the Balkan-style subjunctive in Romanian and ESIDs).

Another fact that these approaches do not account for, as Nikolaeva (2010:1186) rightly points out, is that many non-finite forms are also used in non-subordinated contexts (even though in many of these cases, there is a special modality reading, except for narrative infinitives as discussed above). Imperatives occur exclusively in main clauses and tend to have reduced inflection and co-occurrence with an overt subject. "This indicates that the finiteness opposition may be deeper than the asymmetry defined by the semantics of subordination" (Nikolaeva 2010:1186).

In sum, the typological approaches focus on whether a language has a finiteness opposition at all; if so, certain classes of predicates are more likely to select verbs with reduced finiteness than others. Typologists have formulated implicational hierarchies of predicates selecting a certain type of complement and Romance seems to fit these hierarchies. Nevertheless, these hierarchies do not account for the optionality between subjunctive and infinitives in Romance for many points in these hierarchies. Furthermore, they mostly consider complement clauses. Finally, our goal here is to understand what the difference between finite and non-finite verbs is at a syntactic level, and this should hopefully account for their distribution as described by these typological hierarchies.

4.2 Generative approaches to finiteness

4.2.1 The null case approach

In previous versions of generative grammar, finiteness is assumed as a primitive, being a binary feature on Infl. Both tense and subject licensing work differently when T bears the feature [-finite].

---

[4] There are some cases of optionality:

(i) *A Gianni   ho   detto   di andarsene   /che   se ne vada.*
     to Gianni   have.1SG   said   of leave.INF=REFL=PART /that   RELF=PART=leave.SBJV.3SG
     'To Gianni I said to leave.'

(It.)

Originally, [-finite] was regarded as implying both the absence of tense and the absence of (nominative) case, and hence the absence of overt subjects, as expressed in (54):

(54) Nominative case is licensed by [+finite] Tense/Infl.

(Chomsky 1981:50; Chomsky 1998:39; Bianchi 2003:214)

This original idea has been developed in subsequent research, and both the relationship between finiteness and tense on the one hand and the relation between finite Tense and nominative subject licensing have been reviewed.

With regard to infinitival tense, according to Stowell (1982) and Bošković (1997) there are two types of infinitives. Raising infinitives and ECM infinitives are interpreted as simultaneous to the matrix clause, and do not have tense. Control infinitives on the other hand, do have tense in the sense that they are interpreted as unrealised/future with respect to the matrix verb:

(55) a. Jenny remembered [PRO to bring the wine].

     b. Jenny remembered [PRO bringing the wine].

(56) a. Jim tried [PRO to lock the door].

     b. Jim tried [PRO locking the door].

(Stowell 1982:563)

The infinitival complements are interpreted as *unrealised* with respect to the tense of the matrix; in contrast, the understood tense of the gerund depends on the governing verb. This leads Stowell (1982: 563) to postulate a tense operator in the complementiser position, similar to finite tensed clauses. When the complementiser layer is absent, as is the case in ECM constructions, there is no such tense operator:

(57) a. Bill considers [himself to be the smartest].

     b. The boys found [them to be amusing].

     c. Jane showed [the solution to be trivial].

(Stowell 1982:565)

The unrealised future reading thus does not obtain; all the infinitival clauses have to be interpreted as simultaneous to the matrix verb. The tense is determined wholly by the meaning of the matrix verb.

With respect to the case licensing of the non-finite subject, infinitival subjects are usually represented as PRO, which means that they can be coreferential with an argument of the matrix

clause (control) or arbitrary (PRO~arb~). PRO needs to be licensed; being simultaneously a pronoun and an anaphor, it can only occur in an ungoverned position. Originally, PRO was argued to have no Case as it appears in ungoverned positions. However, because of the similarities in behaviour in terms of A-movement between PRO and Case-marked NPs, PRO is marked for null Case (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993). Not all infinitives have null Case though, as some allow overt subjects (e.g. ECM in English), but these are argued crucially to lack the CP, as it was thought that subject-licensing is partly mediated by C (Koopman 1984; Platzack 1986; Vikner 1995:54–56, a.o.). Assuming that PRO was ungoverned is furthermore contradicted by the fact that Romance controlled infinitives are often proceeded by complementisers AD and DE (Watanabe 1996).

This observation led to a unified analysis of both tense and Case properties of infinitival clauses. Only control infinitives, which have unrealised tense (Stowell 1982), can assign null Case (Bošković 1997; Martin 2001). ECM infinitives are specified as [-Tense], and do not assign null Case. The infinitival subject therefore has to raise to the matrix clause to be assigned accusative Case by the matrix predicate. The difference in tense properties between control infinitives on the one hand and raising and ECM infinitives on the other also explains why only control infinitives can bind the variable of eventive predicates (Bošković 1997).

Problematic for these traditional GB approaches is the fact that they are mostly English-centred. The main assumption is that non-finiteness (formalised as [-finite] Infl) correlates with the absence of agreement features and the impossibility of having an overt nominative subject. As discussed extensively in this thesis, this is not the case for Romance, where we find both inflected and personal infinitives. These accounts do not offer any explanation of the agreement nor do they explain why infinitives in Romance can also license nominative subjects in non-control contexts. According to the null Case approach, lexical subjects need to raise to get Case; second, they should only be found in untensed complements. The fact that Romance infinitives license *nominative* subjects without the need to move them to the matrix clause is not accounted for.

The idea that control infinitives are tensed and others are not also runs into problems. As shown by Raposo (1986:78) and Wurmbrand (2007; 2014) among others, not all control verbs are future-oriented: implicatives and aspectuals such as *try, manage,* and *begin* select complements which are necessarily simultaneous to the main verb. This is confirmed by the corresponding control verbs in Romance, exemplified in (58) for Italian:

(58) a. **Ieri Gianni ha iniziato a cantare domani.*
   yesterday Gianni have.3SG started to sing.INF tomorrow
   'Yesterday Gianni started to sing tomorrow.'

  b. **Ieri Maria ha provato a cantare domani.*
   yesterday Maria have.3SG tried to sing.INF tomorrow
   'Yesterday Maria tried to sing tomorrow.'

  c. *Ieri   Antonio è   riuscito   a cantare domani.*
     yesterday   Antonio be.3SG   managed   to sing.INF tomorrow
     'Yesterday Antonio managed to sing tomorrow.'

                                                                    (It.)

This is however not a problem for Cinque's (2004) view, according to which these are raising predicates, forming one monoclausal construction with the infinitive (see §8.1).

A second problem is the contrast between English and French with respect to epistemic verbs such as *believe*, as first noticed by Kayne (1984). According to the null Case approach, these complements are untensed, and hence cannot feature PRO but select ECM complements, as in the following English examples:

(59) a. John believes Bill to have lied.
      b. *I believe/acknowledge/affirm [PRO to have made a mistake].

                                                    (Kayne 1984:103,112)

Furthermore, because they lack tense, they cannot bind an eventive variable. Therefore, they can only contain stative verbs, or eventive verbs in combination with a temporal auxiliary or a modal to bind the eventive variable (Martin 2001).

In French, however, PRO can appear in these complements (60), and no ECM is possible (61), unless the subject is *wh*-moved (62):

(60) a. *Pierre croit   [PRO avoir   convaincu   son auditoire].*
          Pierre believe.3SG PRO   have.INF convinced   his audience
          'Pierre believes that he has convinced his audience.'
      b. *Pierre a   constaté [PRO avoir   convaincu son auditoire].*
          Pierre have.3SG   noticed PRO   have.INF convinced his audience
          'Pierre has noticed that he convinced his audience.'

                                                    (Fr. Bošković 1997:63)

(61) **Jean croit   Bill   avoir   menti.*
      Jean believe.3SG Bill   have.INF lied
      'John believes Bill to have lied.'

                                                    (Fr., Kayne 1984:103)

(62) *le garçon   que je croyais   être   arrivé*

the boy   that I believe.IPFV.1SG   be.INF arrived

'the boy I believed to have arrived'

<div align="right">(Fr., Kayne 1984:107)</div>

Bošković argues that in French, the complements to verbs such as *croire* do have tense, contrary to their English counterparts, because they allow non-habitual interpretations without the appearance of a modal or an auxiliary:

(63) a. *Je crois   rêver.*

        I   believe.1SG dream.INF

        'I believe that I am dreaming.'

    b. *Anna croyait   arriver   en retard   hier   alors qu' en fait   elle*

        Anna believe.IPFV.3SG arrive.INF   in delay   yesterday   although in fact   she

        était   à l'heure.

        be.IPFV.3SG on the=time

        'Anna believed that she arrived late yesterday although in fact she was on time.'

    c. *Je crois   réussir   l'examen   demain.*

        I believe.1SG   succeed.INF the=exam   tomorrow

        'I believe that I will pass the exam tomorrow.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Bošković 1997:64)</div>

On the basis of these sentences, Bošković (1997:64) concludes that infinitival complements to propositional verbs such as *croire* are [+tense]. This is however not the case in all Romance languages. In Brazilian Portuguese, believe-type complements cannot have a [+eventive] interpretation without an operator and should be interpreted as [-eventive] (Pires 2006:9):

(64) a. **O Paulo   imagina   sohnar.*

        the Paulo   believe.3SG dream.INF

        'Paulo believes that he is dreaming.'

    b. **O Paulo   acreditou   ontem   [viajar   para Londres hoje*

        the Paulo   believe.PRET.3SG yesterday   travel.INF   to   London today

        /há   dois dias].

        /ago two days

        'Paulo believed yesterday that he would travel to London today/two days ago.'

<div align="right">(BrPt., Pires 2006:9)</div>

Nonetheless, PRO is allowed in these complements in Brazilian Portuguese even if the complement is untensed:

(65) *A Maria   acredita   PRO   ter   convencido a platéia.*
the Maria   believe.3SG PRO   have.INF convinced   the audience.
'Mary believes that she convinced her audience.'

(BrPt., Pires 2006:108)

This is problematic for the null Case approach, which predicts that PRO can only appear in tensed (i.e. future/irrealis) infinitival complements.

Neapolitan, on the other hand, does not allow PRO under epistemic verbs:

(66) **Ciro è   sicuro 'e canoscere   a   Mario.*
Ciro   be.3SG   sure of know.INF   DOM   Mario
'Ciro is sure that he knows Mario.'

(Nap. Ledgeway 2000:100)

Some Romance languages do pattern like English. This has been linked to properties of the present tense in this variety (Ledgeway 2000:100ff.).

Even in the Romance languages in which the believe-type complements are tensed, allowing non-habitual interpretations, these do not express a future meaning as argued by Stowell (1982), as shown by the following Italian examples:

(67) a. **Ieri   Gianni credeva   di *(dover/voler)   partire   domani.*
yesterday   Gianni believe.IPFV.3SG   of must.INF/want.INF leave.INF   tomorrow
'Yesterday Gianni believed he would leave tomorrow.'
b. **Ieri   Gianni affermava   di partire   domani.*
yesterday   Gianni declare. IPFV.3SG of leave.INF tomorrow
'Yesterday Gianni declared he would leave tomorrow.'
c. *Gianni afferma/crede   di essersi sbagliato.*
Gianni declare.3SG/believe.3SG   of be.INF mistaken
'Gianni declares/believes that he was mistaken.'

(It.)

The complements have to be simultaneous (70a-b) or appear with a perfective auxiliary (70c).

Therefore, it cannot be maintained that all control complements are future-oriented or tensed. In fact, even in English, there are control verbs that are attitude verbs, such as 'to claim', which do not have a future interpretation:

(68) a. *Yesterday, John claimed to leave tomorrow.
    b. Yesterday, John claimed to be leaving tomorrow.

(Wurmbrand 2014:408)

The third problematic aspect is the assumption within the null Case approach that PRO and lexical subjects are in complementary distribution; the former can only occur in non-finite clauses that are tensed and the letter only in finite clauses or in untensed non-finite clauses. This is not necessarily the case in Romance. For instance, Balkan-style subjunctives allow both PRO and lexical subjects:

(69) a. *Ion vrea PRO   să   vină   la Bucuresti.*
       Ion want.3SG   SA PRO   come.SBJV.3SG to Bucarest
       'Ion wants to come to Bucarest.'
    b. *Ion vrea   să vină   la Bucuresti Ana/*pro.
       Ion want.3SG   SA come.SBJV.3SG to Bucarest Ana
       'Ion wants Ana/him/her to come to Bucarest.'

(Ro.)

Complements to volitionals are irrealis complements with a future interpretation in Bošković's (1997) view; these should license PRO, not lexical subjects. However, both can appear. Furthermore, the same Tense restrictions are found in Romance subjunctives (Terzi 1997:349), which cannot license PRO and only feature lexical subjects. Finally, in English too, there are environments in which both PRO and lexical subjects are allowed, namely clausal gerunds, and complements to the verb *want* (cf. translations of (69)):

(70) a. Susan worried about being late for dinner.
    b. Susan worried about John/him being late for dinner.

(Pires 2006:15)

The assumption underlying the null Case approach runs into various empirical problems.

In conclusion, the distinction assumed in the null Case approach does thus not in English nor in Romance. There are *two* types of controlled infinitival tense (Wurmbrand 2001; 2014; Landau 2003): future/irrealis and simultaneous tense. Wurmbrand (2014) divides the

simultaneous infinitives in two classes, separating the propositional non-future which contains its own tense, from the simultaneous complements to restructuring verbs. It is thus not true in Romance (or English) that all control verbs have future/irrealis tense and that all non-controlled infinitives necessarily have a simultaneous reading. Second, PRO and lexical subjects are not always in complementary distribution, another problem for the null Case approach.

4.2.2   Finiteness as a head in syntactic structure

Within his split CP, Rizzi (1997) argues for a projection FinP, dedicated specifically to the marking of finiteness: "it appears that, at least in these language families, C expresses a distinction related to tense but more rudimentary than tense and other inflectional specifications on the verbal system: finiteness" (Rizzi 1997:283). Even though deviations from the cluster of core properties are attested, he considers finiteness as a cross-linguistically valid notion.

Many syntacticians have adopted this position as the locus of finiteness. For instance, Adger (2007) associates the position Fin with a feature that determines the interpretation of the lower clause as anaphoric to the speech event of the higher clause (following Bianchi 2003). He calls this feature [+finite]. This strongly argues for divorcing subject licensing from the interpretable feature finite. The distinction between uninterpretable features [T] and [Agr] on Fin and the interpretable [finite] feature also entails a divorce between the clausal expression of finiteness and its morphological expression as tense and agreement features. In this model, the [T] and the [Agr] features, are not confined to the Fin projection and may appear lower down the clause. There is no clear mapping from the traditional morphological notion of finiteness to the categories of formal grammar.

The idea of a dedicated position for finiteness is rather problematic. We have seen in the preceding sections that finiteness is not a primitive but has to be divided into several syntactic properties, which may or may not be reflected in morphological marking. If there is not one property or feature that is common to the finite – non-finiteness distinction cross-linguistically, why should we assume there is a functional head within the clause dedicated to it? Finiteness is in fact encoded and distributed in different places in the clause; not just in Fin. Usually within Romance finiteness distinctions are encoded both on C (as shown in the choice between the complementiser *che/que* and the infinitival markers/complementisers AD and DE) and most notably on the verb form, which is located within the I/T-domain (Schifano 2015, 2018). C and T are indeed closely connected; certain features, such as ɸ-features originate on C but can be shared or donated to T (Chomsky 2004; Ouali 2008). We can therefore hypothesise that the same goes for the features related to finiteness: they can be shared between C and T in Romance, but also be expressed solely on one of these heads. In fact, some languages mark finiteness only on the verb,

e.g. Swedish, where the complementiser *att* introduces both finite and non-finite clauses (Vincent 1993:151):

(71) a. *Jan sa   att   den här boken borde   jag ha   läst.*
        Jan say.PST.3SG that   this here book should   I have.INF   read
        'Jan said that this book here I should have read.'

<div align="right">(Swedish, Holmberg & Platzack 1995:83)</div>

b. *Jag föredrar   att   avgå.*
        I prefer.1SG   COMP resign.INF
        'I prefer to resign.'

<div align="right">(Swedish, Harbert 2006:418)</div>

Conversely, other languages mark the distinction only on the complementiser and not on the verb; this is the case in Maltese (Vincent 1993:151), where the verb form is not marked for finiteness but finiteness is marked with the presence or absence of a complementiser (ibidem):

(72) a. *Ix-xhud   qal   **li**   kienet   ix-xita.*
        the-witness say.PST   COMP was   the-rain
        'The witness said it was raining'

b. *Beda   Ø jimxi.*
        he.began   he.walks
        'He began to walk'

<div align="right">(Maltese, Vincent 1993:151)</div>

Furthermore, the finiteness distinction has consequences for the licensing of subjects and the availability of subject positions (see chapter 4§4.2); it bears also on the transparency of the clause as a whole. Finiteness can also be marked through verb movement into a high IP position, or V2 as raising of finite verb to the C-domain in Germanic and Medieval Romance (Vikner 1995; Holmberg 2015; Wolfe 2015). It seems therefore unlikely that finiteness can be reduced to one head within the derivation. Fin, or the C-domain more in general, is thus not the only locus of finiteness: there is therefore no a priori reason why there should be one functional head dedicated specifically to finiteness.

5. Finiteness as anchoring of person and tense

5.1 INFL as a universal anchoring category

Ritter & Wiltschko (2014) argue for a view of the Infl head as a universal anchoring category. This category links the event with the utterance and is endowed with the feature [coin], which stands for coincidence (cf. Hale 1986). The substantive content of this universal category can differ crosslinguistically: INFL may be associated with temporal, personal and spatial marking, which anchors the event situation to the utterance situation. Anchoring is universal, but need not to be mediated by Tense (Ritter & Wiltschko 2014:1339). Mood has also been proposed as an anchoring category in Dravidian (Amritavalli 2014). We will leave the last three types aside, and focus on tense, as in Romance languages anchoring happens mainly through tense.

In Indo-European languages, every indicative root clause must be marked for tense, as illustrated in (73) for English; we can translate this directly into Romance, exemplified here by Italian:

(73) a. Yoshi *is* playing
      b. Yoshi *was* playing.

(Ritter & Wiltschko 2014:1332)

(74) a. *Yoshi* sta *giocando.*
      b. *Yoshi* stava *giocando*.

(It.)

However, *sta* and *stava* are marked not only for tense, but also for person agreement and imperfective aspect. The verbal paradigm of Romance verbs contains *portmanteau* morphemes, marking agreement, tense, mood and aspect. How can we be so sure it is the tense that is anchoring, and not all of these features, or a subset of them? Non-finite verbs can be marked for aspect and agreement, which leaves tense or mood as possible anchoring categories in Romance. I will follow Ritter & Wiltschko (2014) here in that Tense is the substantive content of Infl in Indo-European, and leave the discussion about the relation of mood and finiteness to §6.

In the course of the derivation, the [coin] feature must be valued, otherwise the derivation will crash. Valuation can happen in several ways. In root finite clauses, the valuation happens through the morphological-marking of the category that is associated with INFL, tense in Romance. With non-finite forms (including subjunctive forms), there is no direct anchoring as in finite clauses. They are not deictically anchored (they lack absolute tense , cf. Comrie 1985:chap.

2) to the utterance situation, but anaphorically via the embedding predicate (relative tense, cf. Comrie 1985:chap. 3). This is reflected in the fact that they bear no m(orphological)-marking of tense (as in infinitives) or 'fake' tense marking, as with subjunctives. Even though subjunctives are morphologically marked for what is traditionally labelled a 'tense' (present and past in most Romance varieties, future as well in Portuguese and archaising Spanish; in French and Romanian only the present tense is employed but cf. Romanian and French below), their tense is not free. In fact, it depends on the tense of the matrix clause:

(75) *Voglio   che   tu   vada   /*andassi   via.*
      want.1SG   that you   go.SBVJ.2SG /GO.SBVJ.IPFV.2SG away
      'I want you to go away.'

(76) *Volevo   che tu   *vada   /andassi   via*.
      want.IPFV.1SG that you   go.SBVJ.2SG /GO.SBVJ.IPFV.2SG away
       'I wanted you to go away.'

(It.)

This is usually referred to as the Sequence-of-Tense (*consecutio temporum*) rule in Romance (cf. §6.1). A so-called 'past' subjunctive can refer to a present situation:

(77) *Non sapevo   che tu   fossi   qui   ora.*
      NEG=knw.IPFV.1SG that you be.SUBJ.IPFV.2SG here   now
       'I did not know you are/would be here.'

(It.)

The past subjunctive does not force a past reading, not with respect to the moment of utterance, nor with respect to the matrix verb. There is agreement between tenses rather than a real deictic tense (Giorgi 2010:37). Other subjunctives, of the Balkan type, as found in Romanian, Salentino and southern Calabrian, do not even change morphological tense:

(78) **Ulia   la Maria   ku ʃʃiu   ddai   mprima.*
      want.1SG   the Maria   CU go.PST.3SG there   before
      'I want/wanted Maria to go there before.'

(Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992: 278)

Their present tense must be seen as a default marking. Similarly, in spoken French, the past subjunctive has fallen out of use and the present subjunctive is the default form (Smith 2016:306–7).

Even if it cannot be valued directly, the [coin] feature on the embedded Infl has to be valued. Instead of being anchored to the utterance event, its event situation is anchored to the event denoted by the matrix predicate (cf. Enç 1987). This happens through a process that Ritter & Wiltschko (2014) call *predicate valuation*. Like finite clauses, [coin] can have two values: [+coincidence] and [-coincidence]. This leads to the two types of infinitives that are found in English and Romance: simultaneous (79) and future/irrealis infinitives (80):

(79) *Ieri   Alessia   ha   iniziato a cantare   domani.*
      yesterday Alessia   have.3SG   started   to sing.INF tomorrow
      'Yesterday Alessia started to sing tomorrow.'

(80) *Ieri   Alessia ha   deciso   di   cantare domani.*
      yesterday Alessia have.3SG decided to   sing.INF tomorrow
      'Yesterday Alessia decided to sing tomorrow.'

(It.)

Here, I will adopt the central idea of this proposal, but rather than in the IP, I argue that these distinctions originate in the C-domain[5] which interfaces with the clause above or with the speech act, or more specifically, in the position called *Fin* (cf. Rizzi 1997). The relevant features can be shared however with the I-domain (Chomsky 2004; Ouali 2008). Being *syntactically* finite is taken to mean that the clause is directly anchored to the speech act; non-finiteness arises when the predicate is anchored by the matrix event. The use of non-finite and less finite forms in root contexts will be left aside here and will be discussed in §8.4. Before going into the technical details of the proposed analysis, I will discuss first some other similar proposals of anchoring.

5.2 Other anchoring proposals

There are a series of analyses that have been proposed for finiteness, or related properties such as tense or nominative case licensing, which have all been linked to the idea of anchoring a clause to the speaker or to the speech act.

A similar idea of anchoring the clause to speech time has been proposed by Roussou (2001), who argues that finiteness is a complex notion, which "cannot simply translate to the presence of tense or agreement but is a correlate of tense and Agr (and mood), [...] and *Fin, the position providing the anchoring point to the speech time*" (Roussou 2001:81, emphasis mine). Finiteness

---

[5] This differs from the COMP-valuation of INFL from Ritter & Wiltschko, which happens with modal anchoring for imperatives and counterfactuals.

is thus a property of the Fin head (in the C-domain) rather than Infl as proposed by Ritter & Wiltschko (2014); this Fin head interacts with the inflectional domain/TP. The finiteness of the complement is determined by the selected predicate.

Bianchi (2003) also connects finiteness to both person and tense anchoring. According to her analysis, "every clause is anchored to a Logophoric Centre: a speech or mental event, with its own participants and temporal coordinates, which constitutes the centre of deixis." (Bianchi 2003:215). This logophoric centre is located in the Fin head, and can be external (the external speech event) or internal (all other speech or mental events, which can be encoded syntactically or given by the context). Nominative case marking and person agreement are dependent on the presence of the referential feature [R], which derives from an external logophoric centre; in case of [-R] the subject of a clause is necessarily interpreted as one of the participants in the internal logophoric centre. Bianchi (2003, *apud* Giorgi 2010:61) however argues that the subjunctive is finite, which seems not to be the case as the tense expressed by the subjunctive is not deictic but dependent on the matrix verb; second, there are restrictions on the interpretation of the subject (cf. the discussion in §5.1). Another problematic case for this view, as acknowledged by Bianchi (2001), is given by the personal and inflected infinitive, which are less finite and have dependent tense but allow nominative subjects and person agreement. Finally, in her view, nominative case assignment is connected to person agreement. However, in Romance we have cases of person agreement without case assignment (e.g. controlled/restructuring Balkan-style subjunctives) and nominative case without person agreement (personal infinitives).

Another example is the speaker projection proposed by Giorgi (2010) which encodes tense with respect to the moment of speech. This speaker projection is linked to the first person; she does not say anything explicitly about how this relates to the person interpretation of subjunctives and infinitives in general, which, as we have seen, is not referentially free.

Finally, the semantic analysis put forward by Klein (2006) is that finiteness links the topic (including time, space, world) to the content of the assertion (or what the discourse function of the sentence is). This is a role which is very similar to anchoring, in that finiteness connects the content of the question to the world of the speaker.

In conclusion, all these proposals boil down to the same idea of linking the event described in a proposition to the speech act or the here and now. The proposals differ with respect to the locus of the anchoring: INFL according to Ritter & Wiltschko (2014), Fin according to Roussou (2001) and Bianchi (2003) and the SpeakerP proposed by Giorgi (2010). However, the crucial intuition that finite clauses are linked directly, whereas non-finite clauses/subjunctives are linked through another clause, does not change (cf. also Usonienė & Vincent (2018:23): "non-finite forms lack the deictic properties that can anchor them to particular moments of utterance"). This is the idea that I will adopt here.

5.3 Anchoring of person and tense

As has been described in the previous chapters, embedded clauses (both subjunctives and infinitival clauses) depend on the matrix clause for interpretation of both tense and person/subject. My proposal is that anchoring takes place for *two* properties of the clause: person and tense.

5.3.1   Tense anchoring

As discussed above, indicative main clauses are directly anchored for tense; the finite verb is marked for past, present or future, analytically or syncretically (Enç 1987). The interpretation of the predicate is deictic; it is directly linked to the speech act. This is commonly referred to as 'absolute tense': tenses which take the present moment as their deictic centre (Comrie 1985:36). The same holds for indicative complements to epistemic and declarative verbs, or adjuncts, which can take past, present and future complements independently of the main verb:

(81) *Elisa ha   detto che   fece   /fa   /farà   una torta.*
      Elisa have.3SG said   that   make.PRET.3SG/make.3SG/make.FUT.3SG a cake
      'Elisa said that she made/makes/will make a cake.'

                                                                                    (It.)

(82) *Platón dice/dijo   que Aristóteles lee/leía/leerá   a*
      Plato   say.3SG/say.PRET.3SG that Aristotle   read.3SG/read.PST.3SG/read.FUT.3SG DOM
      Sócrates.
      Socrates
      'Plato says/said that Aristotle reads/read/will read Socrates.'
                                                                      (Sp., Gallego 2010:198)

Not all Romance languages pattern like this, however: Romanian embedded present tense is not always interpreted deictically. Embedded indicatives in Romanian do not show the so-called DAR (double access reading, cf. Giorgi & Pianesi 1997), i.e. the embedded predicate does not need to be simultaneous both with respect to the matrix verb and the utterance time, but only with the former:

(83) a. *(Acum 2 ani)   Gianni a   spus că   Maria e   însărcinată.*
         now two years Gianni have.3SG said that   Maria be.PRS.3SG pregnant

'Two years ago Gianni said that Maria was pregnant.'

(Ro., Giorgi 2010:5)

b. #*Due anni   fa Gianni ha   detto che   Maria è   incinta.*
   two years   ago Gianni have.3SG   said that   Maria be.3SG   pregnant
   'Two years ago Gianni said that Maria was pregnant.'

(It., Giorgi 2010:15)

In other Romance languages, such as Italian (83b), the use of the use of the indicative is really odd in this specific context as the embedded sentence cannot be true anymore. The present tense in Romanian indicative complements reflects a present tense at the moment of saying; it is thus interpreted with respect to the matrix verb, and is thus not directly anchored. However, tense is syntactically free in that the embedded verb can take on past, present and future tenses although the morphology reflects the relation with the matrix tense.

In other embedded clauses, such as infinitival and subjunctive clauses, the embedded tense is interpreted as a relative tense to the matrix clause. Relative tense is tense for which "the reference point for a location of a situation is some point given by the context, not necessarily the present moment" (Comrie 1985:56). This is the case for infinitives (which lack indeed any morphological tense marking): they can be simultaneous or unrealised with respect to the matrix verb (Stowell 1982; Wurmbrand 2014), as seen in examples (79) and (80) above. The difference between finite and infinitival future is exactly that the former is deictic (i.e., the time of the embedded event must be after the utterance time), whereas infinitival future is relative; it needs to be after the reference time of the matrix verb but can be past with respect to the utterance time (Wurmbrand 2014:413). This is also true in subordinate clauses where there is morphological 'tense' marking, such as with the subjunctive, but this tense marking is 'fake' and the traditional labels are misleading (Giorgi 2010:31ff.; Ritter & Wiltschko 2014:1370). The tense agrees with the tense of the matrix clause (see also discussion in §6.1 below); even when referring to the future, a subjunctive complement selected by a verb in the past will show up as an imperfect subjunctive in Romance (cf. discussion above about the *consecutio temporum*). I will call this relative/dependent tense *restricted* tense, as it is restricted by the matrix clause but not completely simultaneous to it.

As discussed above (cf. §4.2.1), there are thus *three* types of tense in embedded contexts (Wurmbrand 2001; 2014; Landau 2003; Spyropoulos 2007; Grano 2015): independent, restricted and anaphoric tense. In the case of independent tense, the embedded tense is not restricted in any way by the matrix clause (as in indicative complements, cf. (87-9) above). A complement with restricted tense is a complement whose temporal interpretation is constrained by, but not identical to, the matrix clause, as is the case with subjunctives and future/irrealis control infinitives. Finally, anaphoric tense is when the tense of the embedded clause needs to be

interpreted as simultaneous to the matrix verb, which is the case with aspectual verbs, implicative verbs, modals, and raising verbs.

These are *syntactic/semantic* types of tense, which have to do with the possible interpretations of an embedded clause with respect to the matrix clause. This does not correspond to their *morphological* tense. Morphologically, tense can be expressed (indicatives, subjunctives) or not (infinitives). The distinction between these types of semantic tense cuts through the morphological division (cf. Landau 2004:838):

Table 5.1 Anchoring and morphological marking of Tense

	Morphologically tensed	**Morphologically untensed**
Independent/Deictic tense [+/- coin]	Indicative complements (84)	Infinitival complements to factives (85)
Restricted tense [-coin]	Subjunctive complements in Romance (86a)/Balkan-style subjunctives (86b)	Infinitival complements to desideratives (87)
Anaphoric tense [+coin]	Balkan-style subjunctives (88)	Infinitival complements to functional (89a) and raising verbs (89b)

(84) *Laura ha   detto che   andò   /va   /andrà   in Italia.*
      Laura have.3SG said   that   go.PRET.3SG /go.PRS.3SG /go.FUT.3SG in Italy
      'Laura has said that she went/goes/will go to Italy.'

(It.)

(85) *O jornalista   lamentou   hoje na BBC   terem   os Americanos*
      the journalist regret.PRET.3SG   today at the BBC have.INF.3PL the Americans
      bombardeado ontem   à   Iuguslavia.
      bombarded   yesterday at.the Yugoslavia.
      'The journalist complained today at the BBC that the Americans have bombarded Yugoslavia.'

(EuPt., Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2002:27)

(86) a. *Volevo   che Eleonora *venga   /venisse   a Bologna.*
         want.IPFV.1SG   that Eleonora come.PRS.SBVJ.3SG /came.IPFV.SBJV.3SG   to Bologna
         'I wanted Eleonora to come to Bologna.'

(It.)

b. *Am   vrut   să vină   Radu mâine.*

 have.1SG wanted SA come.SBVJ.3SG Radu tomorrow

 'I wanted Radu to come tomorrow.'

                    (Ro.)

(87) *Ho   deciso   di partire   domani.*

 have.1SG decided of leave.INF tomorrow

 'I have decided to leave tomorrow.'

                    (It.)

(88) *Ana a   început să lucreze   (*mâine).*

 Ana have.3SG   started SA works.SBJV.3SG tomorrow

 'Ana has started to work (*tomorrow).'

                    (Ro.)

(89) a. *Ieri   ho   potuto   riposarmi   (*oggi/*domani/*l'altro ieri).*

  yesterday   have.1SG been.able   rest.INF=REFL   today/tomorrow/the other day

  'Yesterday I could rest (*today/tomorrow/the other day).'

 b. *Gianni mi sembrò   stare   male (*oggi/*domani).*

  Gianni to.me=seem.PRET.3SG   stay.INF   badly today/tomorrow

  'Gianni seemed to be unwell (*today/*tomorrow).'

                    (It.)

There is thus no one-to-one mapping of the syntactic tense onto morphological structure in Romance. This is again a case of mismatch between types of finiteness: morphological marking does not indicate the level of temporal anchoring of a clause (and thus the level of finiteness of a clause).

5.3.2   Person anchoring

The second property of a clause that relates the event to the speech event is person. 1st and 2nd person are deictic notions that are interpreted based on the (participants of the) speech situation (cf. Bianchi's (2001; 2003) notion of a logophoric centre). Sigurðsson (2004), in fact, argues that person is parallel to tense in that both match or interpret event features (theta-features and E[vent] T[ime], respectively) in relation to speech features (theta-features and S[peech]T[ime]). This section will consider if there are different ways of anchoring person, similar to the three types of anchoring described for tense above.

Normally, person is directly anchored in main clauses and complements to certain predicates. There are no restrictions on how the subject can be interpreted:

(90) *Gianni dice   che   lui stesso / Pietro ha   vinto la gara.*
Gianni say.3SG that   he himself /Pietro have.3SG   won   the race
'Gianni says that he won the race himself/Pietro won the race.'

(It.)

Similar to tense, in certain embedded contexts, the interpretation of subjects can be restricted by or anaphoric to the matrix clause.

One of these contexts is given by *control*, i.e. the phenomenon whereby the subject of a verb, typically an infinitive, is interpreted as coreferent with another NP in the context (the *controller*). Originally, two types of control were distinguished: obligatory control (OC) and non-obligatory control (NOC) (Williams 1980; Landau 2004). They differ in various ways, including the following in case of obligatory control, the presence of a controller is obligatory (91a); this controller must be c-commanding (91b); it must be local (next-clause-up) (91c); and under ellipsis, the complement gets a sloppy reading (91d) (cf. Hornstein 1999:73):

(91) a. *Luca$_i$ inizia   a PRO$_{i/*j}$ cantare.*
Luca start.3SG to PRO   sing.INF
'Luca starts to sing.'

  b. *[La sorella di Luca$_i$]$_j$ inizia   a PRO$_{*i/j}$ cantare.*
The sister   of Luca   start.3SG to PRO   sing.INF
'Luca's sister starts to sing.'

  c. *Gianni$_i$ dice   che Laura$_j$ inizia   a PRO$_{*i/j}$ cantare.*
Gianni   say.3SG   that Laura   start.3SG to PRO   sing.INF
'Gianni says that Laura starts to sing.'

  d. *Luca$_i$ inizia   a cantare e   Laura$_j$ pure [PRO$_{*i/j}$ inizia   a cantare].*
Luca start.3SG   to sing.INF and Laura   also [PRO   start.3SG to sing.INF]
'Luca starts to sing and Laura also (starts to sing).'

(It.)

Cases of NOC do not exhibit any of these properties: the controller may be absent (92a), does not need to be c-commanding (92b), and gets a strict reading under ellipsis (92c):

(92) a. *Gianni$_i$ disse   a Luca$_j$ che PRO$_{i/j/k}$ risolvere il problema   sarebbe   difficile.*

Gianni say.PRET.3SG to Luca that PRO solve.INF the problem be.COND.3SG difficult

'Gianni has said to Luca that solving the problem would be difficult.'

b. *[La sorella di Luca]   disse   che PRO$_{i/j/k}$ risolvere il problema   sarebbe*

the sister of Luca   say.PRET.3SG   that PRO   solve.INF the problem   be.COND.3SG

stato difficile.

been difficult

'Luca's sister said that solving the problem would be difficult.'

c. *Gianni$_i$ disse   a Luca$_j$ che   PRO$_{i/j/k}$ risolvere   il problema   sarebbe*

Gianni   say.PRET.3SG to Luca that PRO   solve.INF   the problem   be.COND.3SG

stato difficile, e   anche Laura   [disse   che   PRO$_{i/j/k}$ risolvere il

been difficult and   also Laura   say.PRET.3SG that PRO   solve.INF   the

problema sarebbe   stato difficile.]

problem be.COND.3SG been difficult]

'Gianni said to Luca that solving the problem would be difficult, and so did Laura.'

(It.)

Landau (2000, 2004) argues for a subdivision within the OC group which correlates with a tense distinction. Some verbs allow so-called partial control, whereby an embedded subject is controlled by the matrix subject but the two can differ in number. Specifically, the controller can be singular but the embedded PRO can be semantically plural (as is shown by verbs which require a semantically plural subject):

(93) John wanted to meet at five.

This gives us in total three types of control: non-obligatory control, exhaustive obligatory control and partial obligatory control. The existence of partial control has been debated in the literature; not all languages seem to have it. Sheehan (2014) argues that instances of apparent partial control in Romance can actually be analysed as obligatory control with covert comitatives, which are licensed only in [+T] contexts. She bases her analysis on data from EuPt., Spanish, French and Italian. Partial control is however possible with inflected infinitives in Sardinian and Portuguese (Sheehan 2014; 2018; Groothuis 2016).

Finally, the subject of an embedded clause can also be obligatorily non-coreferent with the subject of the main clause. This is called *obviation* and is found with many subjunctive complements in Romance (cf. §6.1 below). An example is given in (94):

(94) *O Manel$_i$ deseja   que   (ele$_{*i/j}$) leia   mais livros.*

the Manel   wish.3SG that   he   read.SBJV.3SG   more books

'Manel wishes that he reads more books.'

Obviation can be seen as another way in which the person interpretation of an embedded clause is restricted by the main clause subject, although it is in some sense the opposite of control (Hornstein & San Martin 2013).

As with tense, we can thus distinguish three types of cases for the anchoring of person: anaphoric person (OC), restricted (PC/obviation) and independent (all other cases). Again, there is a mismatch between the morphological presence of ɸ-features on the verb and the freedom of interpretation of the subject, as shown in the following table:

Table 5.2 Anchoring and morphological marking of Person

	Morphologically marked person	**Morphologically unmarked for person**
Independent person	Indicative complements (95)	Personal infinitive (96), NOC
Restricted person [-coin]	Subjunctive complements in Romance (97a), inflected infinitives (97b)	Infinitives with PC (98)
Anaphoric person [+coin]	Balkan-style subjunctives (99)	Infinitival complements to modals (100)/OC/raising

(95) *Due testimoni hanno dichiarato che sono/sei/è complice del furto.*
two witnesses have.3PL declared that be.1SG/be.2SG /be.3SG accomplice of.the theft
'Two testimonies declared that you/I/he/she were/was an accomplice in the theft.'

(It.)

(96) *Dos testigos declararon [ser tú/yo/él/ella cómplice*
two testimonies declare.PRET.3PL be.INF you.NOM/I.NOM/(s)he.NOM accomplice
del robo].
of.the theft
'Two testimonies declared that you/I/he/she were/was an accomplice in the theft.'

(Sp., Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017)

(97) a. *En Jordi_i ha decidit que pro_{*i/j} telefoni al Pere.*

the Jordi have.3SG decided that pro   telephone.SBJV.3SG   to.the Pere

'Jordi has decided that he call Pere.'

<div align="right">(Cat., Picallo 1984b: 279)</div>

b. *Gianni$_i$ cheret   a andaret   pro$_{*i/j}$ a domu.*

Gianni want.3SG   to go.INF.3SG   to house

'Gianni want that he/she goes home.'

<div align="right">(Nuorese Srd.)</div>

(98) *O João   preferia   reunir=se   às 6.*

the João prefer.IPFV.3.SG meet.INF=REFL at.the six

'João preferred to meet at six.'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Sheehan 2014:18)</div>

(99) *Rina$_i$ si=mentìu   PRO$_i$/*pro$_j$/*'Ntoniu   m'i=lava.*

Rina REFL=put.PRET.3SG PRO$_i$/pro$_j$/ Antonio   MU=them=wash.3SG

'Rina began to wash them.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Ledgeway 2007:n. 20)</div>

(100) *Luigi inizia   a PRO$_i$/*pro$_j$/*Antonio   scrivere.*

Luigi begin.3SG to PRO$_i$/pro$_j$/ Antonio   write.INF

'Luigi begins to write.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

Subject raising is generally thought of as property of infinitives. However, there is ample empirical evidence that subject raising with restructuring verbs is also possible in (morphologically) finite contexts, namely in the case of the Balkan-style subjunctive (Terzi 1997; Roussou 2001; Landau 2004), as can be seen in example (99) above.

5.3.3   Finiteness as a combination of Tense and Person anchoring

If there are two properties that can be directly or indirectly anchored to the speech act, the question arises whether indirect anchoring for one implies indirect anchoring for the other. Could the person interpretation be deictic, but the tense interpretation anchored indirectly via a matrix clause, or vice versa? In that case, there would be more ways in which a clause can be (syntactically) non-finite. The answer to this question is affirmative. The different combinations are shown in the following table, which combines table 1 and 2:

Table 5.3 Anchoring of Tense and Person

Anchoring		*Indirectly anchored (predicate valuation) [-direct]*		*Deictically anchored [direct]*
		Anaphoric tense [+coin]	**Restricted tense [-coin]**	**Independent tense [+/-coin]**
Indirectly anchored (predicate valuation) [-direct]	**Anaphoric person [+coin]**	EC with infinitive and Balkan subj [PROTOTYPICAL NON-FINITE]	Controlled complements after 'promise', 'want'	Epistemic/declarative with infinitival complements
	Restricted person [-coin]		Subjunctive complements to desideratives	Subjunctive complements to factive verbs
Deictically anchored [direct]	**Independent person [+/-coin]**		Other subjunctives Personal and inflected infinitives	Indicative clauses [PROTOTYPICAL FINITE]

The semi-finite forms that we have discussed in previous chapters of this thesis seem to present a case of deictic person(-agreement) but no independently anchored (deictic) tense: inflected infinitives and Balkan-style subjunctives (in NOC contexts such as subject clauses and adjuncts). As we will see below in §7, their subject is free or in some cases restricted, and it can be coreferential with the matrix subject, but it does not have to be. Their tense however is determined or restricted by the matrix predicate.

The question arises whether the opposite is also possible: a case where the interpretation of person is restricted by or anaphoric to the matrix clause (cases of control/obviation) but the tense of the clause is dependent or referentially free. This is not attested within Romance. This indicates that there is a hierarchy between tense and person anchoring. Person anchoring seems to be related to tense anchoring in the sense that if tense is anaphoric, person is too. This follows from the Ritter & Wiltschko (2014) approach: in Indo-European, tense is the content that fleshes out INFL, not person, which interacts with it. Person is only a secondary anchoring mechanism which can only be restricted or independent if Tense is not completely anaphoric. In languages

with other primary anchoring mechanisms (e.g. location), we predict that if location is anaphoric, other anchoring mechanisms (e.g. person, tense) also need to be.

Under this approach, which interprets finiteness in terms of anchoring, finiteness regards the opposition between deictically anchored indicative vs anaphorically anchored subjunctives and non-finite forms, rather than morphologically finite and non-finite verbs. In fact, it will be shown in §6 that subjunctives are less finite. Morphological marking is not a reliable indicator for finiteness, as discussed above; there can be mismatches between syntactic finiteness (anchoring) and morphological finiteness (person and tense marking): a form can be finite morphologically but not syntactically (such as the Balkan-style subjunctive). There are also forms, which are syntactically finite but not marked as such morphologically, e.g. the narrative infinitive.

5.4 Anchoring between C and T

If we assume that anchoring to the speech act or to the matrix clause is located in the C-domain, Fin could be the locus of this anchoring, as proposed by Roussou (2001) and Bianchi (2003). It is the lowest head within the C-domain which forms the connection between the C-domain and the I-domain where many finiteness distinctions are expressed. Rather than being marked for finiteness directly, Fin is marked for the anchoring of the two features: tense and person. There is indeed cross-linguistic evidence that tense and person distinctions can be marked within the C-domain (Adger 2007:34–6). Firstly, there are complementisers that mark person agreement in some Dutch dialects, such as West-Flemish and some Limburgian varieties (Haegeman & Van Koppen 2012; Van Koppen 2017):

(101) *Ik denk   de**s**   doow   Marie   ontmoets.*
      I   think.1SG   that.2SG you.SG   Mary   meets.2SG
      'I think that you will meet Mary'

                     (Limburgian, Van Koppen 2011 *apud* Zeijlstra 2012:531)

There are also complementisers that can mark tense, namely in Irish (Cottell 1995), as can be seen in the following minimal pair, where *gur* heads a past tense complement, and *go* a non-past tense complement:

(102) a. *Deir   sé go   dhógfaidh   sé an   peann.*
        say.3SG   he that   take.FUT.3SG   he the   pen
        'He says that he will take the pen.'

      b. *Deir   sé gur   thóg   sé an   peann.*

say.3SG   he that.PST take.PST.3SG   he the   pen

'He says that he took the pen.'

<div align="right">(Irish, Adger 2007:34)</div>

Romance complementisers located in Fin can also mark the degree of anchoring. Infinitival complements can be headed by reflexes of Latin AD and DE. Originally, AD expressed motion towards a goal and is hence frequently used in irrealis complements with inceptive and final value (Maiden 1995:207; Ledgeway 2016b:1015), whereas DE meant 'down from, about, concerning' (Maiden 1995: 207) and is therefore semantically more neutral. Thus, *à/a* vs *de/Ø* (cf. It. *convincere a/di* 'to convince to'*;* Fr. *aider à* 'to help to'*/encourager à* 'to encourage to' vs *avoir raison de* 'to be right to' etc.) typically marks the difference between a simultaneous and irrealis/future infinitive (Ledgeway 2016b:1015):[6]

(103) a. *Mario ha   convinto   Paola a studiare   linguistica.*

Mario have.3SG convinced   Paola to study.INF   linguistics

'Mario has convinced Paola to study linguistics.'

b. *Mario ha   convinto   Paola di aver   studiato linguistica.*

Mario have.3SG   convinced   Paola of have.INF studied linguistics

'Mario has convinced Paola that he has studied linguistics.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

Similarly, Balkan *ca/că* vs *mu/ma/mi/cu/să* indicate the opposition between a deictic vs non-deictic tense. Indirect anchoring can thus be reflected in the choice of a non-finite complementiser (<AD/DE). *Que/che* complementisers on the other hand are ambiguous between deictic (indicative) and dependent (subjunctive) anchoring, and seem to correlate rather with the morphological expression of both tense and person.

This shows us that the C-domain can bear the relevant features. Suppose that these are features that originate in the C-domain (where they are anchored to the speech act or to the matrix clause), but that they can be DONATEd or SHAREd with the inflectional domain (Chomsky 2004; Ouali 2008). If anchoring features indeed originate in the C-domain, rather than in the IP, we expect that there can be finite clauses also in the absence of the IP. O'Neill (2015) provides us with such a case: amalgam copular sentences. She argues that they have no T but are definitely finite.

---

[6] There are nonetheless many exceptions to this general pattern. If a predicate subcategorises for a preposition, this will generally be the prepositional complementiser as well.

These are an example of how the relevant features are kept in the C-domain. An example of an amalgam copular sentence is given in (104):

(104) What she's doing is she's demonstrating the copular amalgam.

<div align="right">(O'Neill 2015:3)</div>

These sentences do not have a I-domain (O'Neill 2015: 399ff.), but are directly anchored to the speech act.

In the same vein, we expect that in the absence of a C-domain, anchoring cannot take place and both person and tense are anaphoric. Reduced clauses such as restructuring complements are indeed all cases of simultaneous and OC complements. The correlation between finiteness and clause size will be further explored in §8.

6. Finiteness and mood

6.1 Subjunctives are less finite

Subjunctives pattern with infinitival complements, rather than indicative ones, in various ways. They show once more that there is a mismatch between syntactic and morphological finiteness. In this section, I will only consider the 'standard Romance' subjunctive and leave the discussion of the Balkan-style subjunctive to §7.2.

First, as discussed above, subjunctives lack independent tense reference (Picallo 1984b; Raposo 1986; Tsoulas 1996; Giorgi 2010:31ff.). Their tense interpretation is not necessarily coreferent with the matrix clause tense, but is limited by it. This is reminiscent of the interpretation of infinitivals (cf. §4.2 and §5.3.1). Consider the following representative examples, where the tense of the embedded verb is restricted by the tense of the matrix verb:

(105) a. *Platón quiere   que Aristóteles lee   /*leyera   /*leyere*

      Plato want.3SG   that Aristotle   read.SBJV.3SG/read.PST.SBJV.3SG/read.FUT.SBJV.3SG

      a   Sócrates.

      DOM Socrates

      'Plato wants that Aristotle reads/read/will read Socrates.'

   b. *Platón   quería   que Aristóteles *lea   /leyera   /*leyere*

      Plato   want.PST.3SG that Aristotle   read.SBJV.3SG /read.PST.SBJV/read.FUT.SBJV

      a   Sócrates.

      DOM Socrates

'Plato wants that Aristotle reads/read/will read Socrates.'

<div align="right">(Sp., Gallego 2010:198)</div>

(106) a. *Desitja   que porti   /hagi   portat   /*portés*
       desire.3SG   that bring.SBJV.3SG   /have.SBJV.3SG brought /brought.SBVJ.PST.3SG
       */*hagués portat   un llibre.*
       /had.SBJV.3SG brought   a book
       'S/he wishes that s/he brings/has brought a book.'

   b. *Desitjà   que   *porti   /*hagi portat   /portés*
       desire.PST.3SG that   bring.SBJV.3SG /have.SBJV.3SG brought /brought.SBVJ.PST.3SG
       */*hagués portat   un llibre.*
       /had.SBJV.3SG brought   a book
        'S/he wished that s/he brought/had brought a book.'

<div align="right">(Cat., Picallo 1984b:87)</div>

In all these examples, the tense of the embedded subjunctive verb is dependent on the matrix verb: if the matrix verb is in the past, so is the embedded verb; if the matrix verb is present (or future), the subjunctive is in the present tense as well (or optionally in the future tense, in Portuguese and archaising Spanish). This shows that the tense of the subjunctive clause is not directly anchored to the speech act but depends on the matrix clause (cf. Giorgi 2010:112).

The phenomenon of Sequence of Tense is not exceptionless; in some cases, both a present and a past subjunctive can be embedded under a past matrix verb:

(107) a. *Ordené   a Pedro que   terminara   el proyecto.*
       order.PRET.1SG to Pedro that   finish.SBJV.PST.3SG   the project

   b. *Ordené   a Pedro que   termine   el proyecto.*
       order.PRET.1SG to Pedro that   finish.SBJV.PRES.3SG   the project
       'I ordered Pedro to finish the project.'

<div align="right">(Sp., Kempchinsky 2009:1790)</div>

(108) a. *Gianni ha   ipotizzato   che   Maria fosse   incinta.*
       Gianni have.3SG   hypothesised that   Maria be.SBJV.PST.3SG pregnant

   b. *Gianni ha   ipotizzato   che   Maria sia   incinta.*
       Gianni have.3SG   hypothesised that   Maria be.SBJV.PRES.3SG   pregnant
       'Gianni has hypothesised that Maria was/is pregnant.'

<div align="right">(It., Giorgi 2010:41)</div>

In both cases, the choice of the embedded tense leads to a change in meaning. In the first case, the choice of the present tense implies that Pedro has not yet finished the project. Similarly, in the second case, the use of the present tense (110b, 111b) instead of the past tense (110a, 111a) implies that Maria is also pregnant at the moment of speech (Double-Access Reading). These examples seem to indicate that the subjunctive tense morphology is not *always* purely an agreement marker with the tense in the matrix clause, but these are exceptional cases, which will be left aside here.

Second, subjunctives in most Romance languages trigger the so-called 'disjoint reference effect' (also known as 'obviation'), i.e. the subject of the embedded subjunctive clause cannot be coreferent with the matrix subject:

(109) *O Manel$_i$ deseja   que (ele$_{*i/j}$)   leia   mais livros.*
the Manel   wish.3SG that   he   read.SBJV.3SG   more books
'Manel wishes that he reads more books.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1986:77)

(110) *Jean$_i$ veut   qu'il$_{*i/j}$ aille   à Paris.*
Jean want.3SG   that=he   go.SBJV.3SG   to Paris
'Jean wants that he goes to Paris.'

(Fr., Progovac 1993:45)

(111) *Laura$_i$ vuole   che   pro$_{*i/j}$ prepari   la cena.*
Laura want.3SG   that   pro   prepare.SBJV.3SG   the dinner
'Laura wants that s/he prepares dinner.'

(It.)

This effect is only found with subjunctive complements, not with indicative ones. There are thus restrictions on the interpretation of the subject of subjunctives which do not hold for indicative complements. We could say that the subjunctive complement is less finite, because the anchoring of the person of the embedded clause is restricted by the matrix person. Generally, the obviation effect is strongest with volitional verbs: there can be more variation with other subjunctive complements (Farkas 1991; Kempchinsky 1987; 2009).

In some Romance varieties, subjunctive subjects can be coreferent with the matrix subject as well, as can be seen in this Neapolitan example:[7]

(112) *Ciro$_i$ prummette   che Ø$_{i/*j}$/isso$_{i*/j}$ accatta 'e   purtualle.*
    Ciro promise.3SG that he   buy.3SG the oranges
    'Ciro promises to buy the oranges.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:68)

Note that the verb form is not marked for subjunctive (the verbal morphology for the subjunctive is lost in most parts of southern Italy (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014; Ledgeway 2016d)), only the complementiser *che* is. The subject is only obviative whenever it is overtly expressed.

The subject of the subjunctive can however be coreferent with the matrix clause object; obviation only holds for coreference between subjects, not for arguments more generally:

(113) a. *Ugo le dice   di non   fare la stronza.*
        Ugo to.her=say.3SG of NEG   do.INF the bitch
    b. *Ugo le dice   che non faccia   la stronza.*
        Ugo to.her= say.3SG   that NEG do.SBJV.3SG   the bitch
        'Ugo told her not to behave as a bitch.'

(It., Ledgeway 2016:1014)

In these cases, the infinitival complement and the subjunctive complement are interchangeable. In both cases there is obligatory object control, as the embedded subject can only be understood as coinciding with the dative clitic *le*. More generally, subjunctives replace the infinitive in many uses in spoken Romance, especially in Ibero-Romance (Ledgeway 2016: 1015 n.3-4); the inflected infinitive is also regularly replaced by subjunctive (its historical source, cf. §6.1).

We can conclude that the interpretation of the subject of a subjunctive clause is thus not always free, but often subject to restrictions of dissimilarity, or less frequently, similarity. This is again more similar to infinitival complements, whose subjects can be limited (in the sense that they are obligatorily coreferential) by the matrix clause arguments. On the other hand, the subject of indicative complements and main clauses is always free.

Subjunctive verbs pattern very similarly to infinitives also in terms of verb movement, as has been shown in the literature (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014:37; 2015:202–13; Schifano 2018)

---

[7] Romanian subjunctives, as has been described extensively in the literature (Farkas 1991; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), do not show the disjunct reference effect. See §7.2 for discussion of the Balkan-style subjunctive.

and the previous chapter of this dissertation. Unlike finite verbs, which display a wide range of variation in terms of the position they target within the I-domain, subjunctive and infinitival forms consistently target a high position across Romance:

(114) a. *O Pedro disse   que a   Maria (*conhece) já   conhece   esta história.*
the Pedro say.PRET.3SG that the Mary know.3SG   already know.3SG   this   story
'Mary already knows this story.'

   b. *Eu quero   que a Maria   leia   já   (*leia)   este livro.*
I want.1SG   that the Mary   read.SBJV.3SG   already read.SBVJ.3SG   this book
'I want Maria to read this book now .'

<div align="right">(EuPt., Schifano 2018:98)</div>

(115) a. *Durant les classes d'història, Joan (dorm) sempre dorm.*
during   the   classes of history Joan   sleep.3SG   always sleep.3SG
'During the history classes, Joan always sleeps.'

   b. *Joan vol   que   la seva dona prepare   sempre (*prepare)   les*
Joan want.3SG that   the his wife prepare.SBJV.3SG always   prepare.SBVJ.3SG the
postres.
desserts
'Joan wants his wife to always prepare the desserts.'

<div align="right">(VCat., Schifano 2018:100)</div>

As shown in these examples, the subjunctive forms move higher than the corresponding indicative forms; this is similar to the infinitive (cf. chapter 4). French and Romanian are an exception in this case – the subjunctive patterns exactly like the indicative, as both move very high:

(116) a. *Jean a   dit   que   le jardinier   coupe   généralement (*coupe) les arbustes.*
Jean have.3SG said   that   the gardener   cuts.3SG generally   cut.3SG   the bushes
'Jean has said that the gardener usually cuts the bushes.'

   b. *Je veux   que   le jardinier   coupe   généralement (*coupe)   les arbustes.*
I   want.1SG that   the gardener   cut.SBJV.3SG generally   cut.SBJV.3SG the bushes
'I want the gardener to usually cut the bushes.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Schifano 2018:96)</div>

(117) a. *Mi-a   spus că   soția sa pregătește întotdeauna (pregătește)   desertul.*

to.me=have.3SG   said that wife his prepare.3SG always   prepares   dessert.DET

'He told me that his wife always prepares the dessert.'

b. *Ion vrea   ca   soţia sa să pregătească   întotdeauna (*#să pregătească)*

Ion want.3SG   that   wife his SA prepare.SBJV.3SG   always

desertul.

dessert.DET

'Ion wants his wife to always prepare the dessert.'

(Ro., Schifano 2018:273–4)

The French subjunctive is probably not different from that of other Romance languages; but in French, indicative verb movement targets a high position in general so there is no noticeable difference in verb movement of the subjunctive. In Romanian, although the preferred order is for the verb to move high, this is the only option in the subjunctive whereas the order Adv-V is possible in the indicative.

A further property that sets subjunctives and infinitives apart from indicatives is C(omplementiser)-drop, which is only possible with subjunctives and Aux-to-Comp infinitives and gerunds (Poletto 2001; Ledgeway 2016b; Schifano 2018):

(118) *Credo   (che) abbia   già   parlato con te.*

believe.1SG that have.SBJV.3SG already talked   with you

'I believe that he has already talked to you.'

(It., Poletto 2001:267)

(119) *Mario afferma   non essere lui   in grado   di affrontare la situazione.*

Mario declare.3SG   NEG be.INF he   in degree   of face.INF   the situation

'Mario declares that he is not able to face the situation.'

(It., Rizzi 1982:79–80)

Another syntactic property that subjunctives share with infinitives is that a subjunctive complement is less opaque than an indicative complement. This can be seen for instance with NPI licensing and binding properties. NPIs need to be licensed by the presence of a negator in Romance. This negator has to be local and the licensing cannot take place across a clause-boundary. However, across the boundary of subjunctive clauses it can, showing that these are more transparent:

(120) *No   creo   que Pedro haya   /*ha   traído   nada.*

NEG   think.1SG   that Pedro have.SBJV.3SG /have.IND.3SG brought nothing

'I do not think that Pedro has brought anything.'

<div align="right">(Sp., Uribe-Etxebarria 1996:309)</div>

(121) a. **Non dico che tu arresti nessuno.*
         NEG say.1SG that you arrest.2SG nobody

    b. *Non pretendo che tu arresti nessuno.*
         NEG require.1SG that you.SG arrest.SBJV.2SG nobody
         'I do not require you to arrest anybody.'

<div align="right">(It., Rizzi 1982:124)</div>

(122) a. **No crec que ve ningú.*
         NEG think.1SG that come.3SG nobody
         'I do no think anybody comes.'

<div align="right">(Cat., Picallo 1984b:96)</div>

    b. *No vull que tu parlis amb ningú.*
         NEG want.1SG that you.SG speak.SBJV with nobody
         'I do not want you to speak with anybody.'

<div align="right">(Cat., Picallo 1984b:97)</div>

A similar opacity effect is attested with morphologically simple reflexives (Giorgi 1984:198; Progovac 1993); binding of *proprio* 'own' can happen in subjunctive but not indicative clauses:

(123) *Gianni$_i$ suppone [che tu sia innamorato della propria$_i$ moglie].*
     Gianni suppose.3SG that you.SG be.SBJV.2SG in.love of.the own wife
     'Gianni supposes that you are in love with his own wife.'

<div align="right">(It., Giorgi 1984 *apud* Progovac 1993:40)</div>

(124) **Gianni$_i$ mi ha detto che tu sei innamorato della propria$_i$*
     Gianni to.me=have.3SG told that you.SG be.2SG in.love of.the own
     moglie.
     wife
     'Gianni has told me that you are in love with his own wife.'

<div align="right">(It., Giorgi 1984 *apud* Progovac 1993:40)</div>

Similarly, in French, *soi* 'him/herself' can refer back to the matrix subject only in subjunctive complements, as in (125a), but not in indicative complements (125b):

(125) a. *On~i~ ne*   *souhaite*   *jamais*   *que les gens*   *ne*   *regardent*   *que soi~i~.*
one NEG wish.3SG   never   that the people NEG   look.at.SBVJ.3PL than REFL
'One never wishes that people look only at oneself.'

    b. **On~i~ ne*   *dit*   *jamais*   *que les gens*   *disent*   *du*   *mal de soi~i~.*
one NEG say.3SG   never   that the people say.PL   of.the bad of REFL
'One never says that people slander oneself.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Pica 1985 apud Progovac 1993:40)</div>

With respect to extraction phenomena, subjunctives also pattern like infinitives, rather than indicatives, as observed by Chomsky (1986, see also Tsoulas 1996). As can be seen in the following examples from French, *wh*-elements other than subjects can be extracted from an embedded *wh*-clause only when the clause is non-finite or subjunctive, but not with the indicative. This contrast is another indication that the transparency for syntactic operations typical for non-finite clauses includes subjunctives as well.

(126) a. **Que te demandes-tu*   *à qui*   *Sophie a*   *donné?*
what REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   to whom   Sophie have.3SG   given
'What do you wonder to whom Sophie has given?'

    b. **Á qui*   *te demandes-tu*   *ce que*   *Sophie a donné?*
to whom REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   what that   Sophie have.3SG   given
'To whom do you wonder what Sophie has given?'

<div align="right">(Fr. Tsoulas 1996:298)</div>

(127) a. *Que te demandes-tu*   *à qui donner?*
what REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   to whom give.INF
'What do you wonder to give to whom?'

    b. *Á qui*   *te demandes-tu*   *quoi donner?*
to whom REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   what give.INF
'Who whom do you wonder what to give?'

<div align="right">(Fr. Tsoulas 1996:298)</div>

(128) a. *Que te demandes-tu*   *qui*   *a*   *voulu*   *que Sophie*   *voie?*
what~i~ REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   who~j~ have.3SG wanted   that   Sophie   see.SBJV.3SG
'Who do you wonder has wanted that Sophie sees what?'

    b. *Que te demandes-tu*   *qui*   *a*   *exigé*   *que Sophie écrive?*
what~i~ REFL=wonder.2SG=you.SG   who~j~ have.3SG required that   Sophie writes.SBJV.3SG
'Who do you wonder that has required that Sophie wrote what?'

Similarly, adverb and quantifier raising in French can occur from subjunctive and infinitival clauses, but not from indicative clauses:

(129) a. *Il aurait   mieux   voulu   se comporter.*
      he have.COND.3SG better   wanted   REFL=behave.INF
      'He would have wanted to behave himself better.'

   b. *Il faut   très bien   que tu   te comportes.*
      It be.necessary.3SG   very well   that you.SG   REFL=behave.SBJV.2SG
      'It is necessary that you behave very well.'

(130) a. *Marie a   tous   voulu   les   lire.*
      Marie have.3SG   all   wanted them=read.INF
      'Marie wanted to read all.'

   b. *Elle n'aurait   rien   osé   dire.*
      she NEG= have.COND.3SG nothing dared   say.INF
      'She would not have dared to say anything.'

   c. *Il faut   tous   que Jean les   lise.*
      it be.necessary.3SG   all   that Jean them=read.SBJV.3SG
      'It is necessary for Jean to read them all.'

   d. *Je veux   tout   que tu   leur   enlèves.*
      I want.1SG   all   that you.SG to.them=take.away.SBJV.2SG
      'I want that you take everything away from them.'

It has been proposed that adverb and quantifier raising should be seen as restructuring phenomena in French, a language that only very marginally shows clitic climbing and other transparency effects typically attested with restructuring. However, Cinque (2006:103–7) shows that both phenomena are also found with subjunctives, as in (129b, 130cd), which is another piece of evidence that subjunctives and infinitives share many properties.

Finally, on a semantic/pragmatic level, subjunctives pattern with infinitives. When used in matrix context, subjunctives have a special discourse function; they lack a truth value (Progovac 1993). Rather than asserting (cf. §2.3), they express wishes or commands:

(131) a. *Comprem   eles   o livro!*

buy.SBJV.3PL   they   the book

'That they buy the book! And can study!'

b. *(Que) venham   as chuvas!*

that   come.3.PL.SBJV the rains

'May the rain come!'

<div align="right">(EuPt., (Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:3)</div>

(132) a. *Si accommodi,   per favore.*

REFL=accommodate.SBJV.3SG   please

'Sit down, please.'

b. *(Che) la   forza sia   con te.*

that   the   force be.SBJV.3SG   with you

'May the force be with you.'

c. *Non l'avessi   mai   fatto!*

NEG it=had.SBJV.1SG   never   done

'I wish I had never done it!'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

This makes them very similar to non-finite forms used in matrix contexts:

(133) a. *Non   andare   là!*

not   go.INF   there

'Don't go there!'

b. *Io, andarci   da sola?!*

I   go.INF=LOC   of alone

'Me, going there on my own?!'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

We can therefore conclude that subjunctive complements are less finite than indicative complements (cf. Vincent 1998; Barron 2000:5). The relevant distinction is thus not morphologically finite vs non-finite forms, but deictically vs indirectly anchored, i.e. indicative vs subjunctives and infinitives. Tsoulas (1996) similarly proposes that the distinction between clausal definiteness/indefiniteness, where subjunctives and infinitives are considered indefinite because they do not refer to a single precise temporal point, should replace the traditional finite vs non-finite distinction. This temporal indefiniteness is parallel to indefinite DPs, which do not

have a precise referent. The next section will investigate why subjunctives should behave like non-finite clauses, and what the relationship between finiteness and mood is.

6.2 Finiteness as mood

The question which remains is about the role of mood in anchoring. If subjunctives are to be seen as non-finite/less finite, what is the relation between mood and finiteness? Is non-finiteness a mood or is non-finiteness absence of mood (Vincent 1996)? Crucially, there seem to be no non-finite forms which are marked for mood (Vincent 1996; Noonan 2007; Nikolaeva 2010:1177).

As Nikolaeva (2010: 1185) notes, "complements of cognitive predicates are canonically more finite than complements of volitional and some other predicates. This is because the former introduce an independent world (existential temporal anchoring) and the latter introduce a set of worlds (intensional anchoring)." It seems to be common to all non-indicative clauses to be not directly anchored, including the optative, subjunctive and imperative. They are all anchored to another world (cf. Kempchinsky 2009) which is not (yet) realised.

Historically, the functional position between T and C has been referred to as MP, where M stands for Mood (cf. e.g. Roussou 2000:73). This shows us that the two are actually two sides of the same coin; i.e. both are not directly anchored to the speech event but indirectly, via another event or via a parallel possible world.

So, if non-finite and modally marked forms show many similarities, it is due to their indirect anchoring which they have in common, although they are not anchored in the same way: non-finite forms are anchored through another clause; modally marked forms are anchored to another world which differs from the world the speech act takes place in. The locus of this anchoring is Fin.

7. 'Semi-finite' forms

In the preceding chapters of this thesis, we have informally considered 'semi-finite' forms such as inflected infinitives, personal infinitives and the Balkan-style subjunctives, which replace many uses of the infinitives. In this section, we will review their properties once more to see how they fit into the approach to finiteness sketched above.

7.1 Inflected and personal infinitives

Comparing the personal and inflected infinitives with other forms regarding the anchoring of tense and person, we see that their tense is dependent but their person is usually free.

Starting with tense, it can be noted that the inflected infinitives usually appear in embedded clauses with dependent tense, such as complements to volitionals[8] (134), factive complements (135), subject clauses, and adjuncts:

(134) *Non keljo   a bi=venneres   tue.*
NEG want.1SG   to LOC=come.INF.2.SG   you.SG
'I do not want you to come there.'

(Srd., Jones 1993: 279)

(135) *O jornalista   lamentou   hoje na BBC   terem   os Americanos*
the journalist regret.PRET.3SG   today at the BBC have.INF.3PL   the Americans
bombardeado ontem   à   Iuguslavia.
bombarded   yesterday   at.the Yugoslavia.
'The journalist complained today at the BBC that the Americans have bombarded Yugoslavia.'

(EuPt., Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2002:27)

(136) *Não é   óbvio   passarmos   no exame.*
NEG be.3SG obvious pass.INF.1.PL   in.the   exam
'It is not obvious that we pass the exam.'

(BrPt., Da Luz 1998:9)

(137) *Fixérono   para traballaren   ledos.*
do.PST.3PL=it   for   work.INF.3.PL   happy
'They did this to work happily.'

(Gal., Longa 1994:28)

Personal infinitives on the other hand mostly appear in unselected clauses such as adjuncts (138) and more rarely in subject clauses (139):

(138) a. *Després d'arribar   nosaltres,   va   començar   la reunió.*
after   of arrive.INF we   go.3SG   start.INF   the meeting
'After we arrived, the meeting started.'

(Cat., Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016:1296–7)

---

[8] This use is not allowed in European Portuguese.

b. *Primme de succedere chesto, ha ditto che fa cose de pazze!*
before of happen.INF this, have.3SG said that do.3SG things of crazy
'Before this happens, he said he'll get up to wild things!'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:116)

(139) a. *Cummena a num benire tu*
be.better.3SG of NEG come.INF you.SG
'It is better for you not to come.'

(Nap., Ledgeway 2000:117)

b. *Menjar ara nosaltres no seria mala idea.*
eat.INF now we NEG be.COND.3SG bad idea
'It would not be a bad idea for us to eat now.'

(Cat., Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999:399)

Italian Aux-to-Comp and Portuguese inflected infinitives can be selected by declarative and epistemic verbs, which like in English, pose aspectual restrictions on their complement. No episodic interpretation is possible with bare infinitives, only habitual; other options are perfective auxiliaries or statives:

(140) *O Manel pensa terem os amigos levado o livro.*
the Manel thinks have.INF.3.PL the friends taken the book
'Manel thinks that his friends have taken the book.'

(EuPt., Raposo 1987:98)

(141) *Suppongo non esser la situazione suscettibile di ulteriori miglioramenti.*
suppose.1SG NEG be.INF the situation sensitive of further improvements
'I suppose that the situation is not sensitive to further improvements.'

(It., Rizzi 1982:79–80)

Their tense is however not restricted. Similarly, the interpretation of person is completely free.

Moving on to person anchoring, it can be noted that there are different anchoring possibilities. Personal and inflected infinitives typically appear in NOC contexts, which makes the interpretation of person free. According to Pires (2006:92–5), inflected infinitives show all the properties of NOC listed by Hornstein (1999):

(142) a. *Os nossos_j pais lamentam pro_j chegarmos tarde.*

the our   parents   regret.3PL pro   arrive.INF.1.PL   late

'Our parents regret our arriving late.'

b.   *O Paulo   lamenta   pro_k termos   perdido e   a Silvia   também.*

the Paulo   regret.3SG pro   have.INF.1.PL   lost   and   the Silvia   as.well

(=lamenta   nós   termos   perdido).

regrets   we.NOM   have.INF.1.PL   lost

'Paulo regrets our losing and Silvia does too.'

c.   *Eu_j convenci   a   Maria_k   a viajarmos_{j+k}   com o Paulo.*

I convince.PRET.1SG   the   Maria   to travel.INF.1.PL   with the Paulo

'I convinced the Maria that we should travel with Paulo.'

(BrPt., Pires 2006:93–95)

However, in certain cases, the interpretation of person is restricted with inflected infinitives. Contrary to what is often said in the literature, they can also appear in OC contexts, as shown by Sheehan (2013; 2018) and Groothuis (2016):

(143) *O Pedro   prometeu   à   Ana   reunirem=se   em Braga.*

the Pedro   promise.PRET.3SG to.the Ana   meet.INF.3.PL=REFL   in Braga

'Pedro promised Ana to meet in Braga.'

(EuPt., Sheehan 2013:3)

(144) *Su professore   at   cumbintu   sos istudientes   a imparapren   sa limba*

the professor   have.3SG convinced   the students   to learn.INF.3.PL   the language

sarda.

Sardinian

'The professor has convinced the students to learn Sardinian.'

(Srd.)

Paradoxically, there is also an obviation effect both in the Portuguese (although there is a lot of intraspeaker variation, cf. Sitaridou 2007:193n.1) and Sardinian inflected infinitive:

(145) *%Os deputados lamentam   estarem   sempre a   perder   os documentos.*

the deputies   regret.3PL   be.INF.3PL   always to   lose.INF   the documents

'The deputies regret always losing their documents.'

(EuPt., Sitaridou 2007:193n.1)

(146) *Gianni_i   cheret   a andaret   pro*_{*i/j} *a domu.*

Gianni   want.3SG   to go.INF.3.SG   to house

'Gianni want that he/she goes home.'

(Srd.)

Historically, inflected infinitives derive from the Latin imperfect subjunctive in Portuguese, Galician and Sardinian (Pittau 1972; Jones 1993; Martins 2001; Pires 2002; 2006; Pisano 2008). The obviation effect can be considered as a property that the inflected infinitive has kept during the reanalysis of the imperfect subjunctive to the inflected infinitive. Thus, with respect to person anchoring, two levels are attested with the inflected infinitive: control/obviation and referentially free.

In terms of opacity, inflected infinitives are less transparent than uninflected infinitives: raising out of an inflected infinitive is disallowed.

(147) a. *Parecia   as estrelas   sorrirem.*

seems.3SG   the stars   smile.INF.3.PL

'It seems that the stars smile.'

b. *As estrelas   pareciam   sorrir(*em).*

the stars   seem.3PL   smile.INF.3.PL

'The stars seem to smile.'

(EuPt., Quicoli 1996: 62)

In sum, the inflected infinitive is in many cases as finite as a subjunctive when we look at anchoring, even though the morphological marking and the non-finite complementisers seem to indicate otherwise.

7.2 Balkan-style subjunctives

Generally, subjunctive forms have traditionally been considered 'finite', given the presence of agreement morphology on the verb. This also includes the Balkan-style subjunctive. However, since it has been shown above that subjunctives are less finite than infinitives, we can wonder whether they would still qualify as finite under the present approach. In this section, we will briefly review the main anchoring and opacity properties of the Balkan-style subjunctives to determine their degree of finiteness.

Balkan-style subjunctives are characterised by the obligatory use of the present tense form (often identical to the present indicative, except for the 3rd person in Romanian, as well as the forms of *a fi* 'to be'; similarly, some central-southern Salentino varieties have traces of subjunctive

forms) and the absence of SOT effects. Past forms are banned in the subjunctive complement, even if the matrix verb is a past form, as shown in the following Salentino examples:

(148) a. *Oyyu la Maria ku bbae ddai mprima.*
       want.1SG the Maria CU come.3SG there before
       'I want Maria to go there before.'

    b. **Ulia la Maria ku ʃʃiu ddai mprima.*
       want.IPFV.1SG the Maria CU go.PST.3SG there before
       'I wanted Maria to go there before.'

<div align="right">(Sal., Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1992:278)</div>

This morphological present tense does not reflect the temporal interpretation of the clause, as can be seen in (148). Syntactically, the embedded tense is dependent just like with non-finite forms such as the subjunctive and the infinitive. Two of the embedded tenses described in §4.3.1 are found: anaphoric tense and the future/irrealis tense. The first tense is found with exhaustive control verbs, including modals and aspectuals; the latter is found with other control verbs:

(149) *Ana a început să lucreze (*mâine).*
     Ana have.3SG started SA works.SBJV.3SG tomorrow
     'Ana has started to work (*tomorrow).'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

(150) *Ieri am decis să lucrez (mâine).*
     yesterday have.1SG decided SA work.SBJV.1SG tomorrow
     'I have decided to work (tomorrow).'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

Tense is thus always indirectly anchored: it is simultaneous or dependent on the matrix tense. Therefore, the Balkan-style subjunctive is less finite than a canonical, directly anchored form.

       With regard to person anchoring, we need to make a distinction between F(ree)-subjunctives and C(ontrol)-subjunctives as proposed by Landau (2004:827). The C-subjunctives are those whose subject is controlled by the subject of the main clause; these are cases of exhaustive local subject control. C-subjunctives are selected by functional verbs, such as modals and aspectuals, which take a infinitival VP as their complement and raise the subject, as in (149) and (151), and implicatives.

(151) *Rina_i si=mentìu*   *PRO_i/*pro_j/*'Ntoniu m'i=lava.*

Rina REFL=put.PRET.3SG PRO_i/pro_j/ Antonio   MU=them=wash.3SG

'Rina began to wash them.'

<div align="right">(SCal., Ledgeway 2007:n. 20)</div>

With F-subjunctives, the interpretation of the subject is free: the subject can co-refer with the subject but it does not have to. A sentences like the one in (152) is ambiguous between a coreferential and non-referential reading:[9]

(152) *Ion vrea*   *să vină*   *la Bucuresti (el/Ana).*

Ion want.3SG   SA come.SBJV.3SG to Bucarest he/Ana

'Ion wants to come/that Ana comes to Bucarest.'

<div align="right">(Ro.)</div>

There is thus no disjoint subject reference effect with Balkan-style subjunctives in most varieties.[10]

However, some implicative, verbs which display OC in most Romance languages, can have a complement with a non-coreferential subject in Romanian (Cotfas 2014; 2016b):

(153) a. *Încerc* *să nu treacă*   *o zi*   *fără*   *să fac*   *sport.*

    try.1SG S A NEG pass.SBVJ.3SG a day   without SA do.SBJV.1SG sport

    'I try to not let a day pass without doing sports.'

<div align="right">(via Google 06/09/18)</div>

    b. *Am*   *reuşit*   *ca*   *in ziua*   *de 25 septembrie,*   *11.500*   *de voluntari*

      have.1SG   managed   that in day.DET of 25 September   11.500   of volunteers

      să strângă   *peste 25.000* *de saci de gunoi.*

      SA collect.SBJV.3PL over 25.000   of bags of litter

      'I have succeeded that on the 25th of September, 11,500 volunteers should collect over 25,000 bags of litter.'

<div align="right">(Ro., Cotfas 2014:43)</div>

---

[9] Alexiadou et al. (2010) suggest that the obviation is triggered whenever *ca* is present (i.e. when the left periphery is activated), but my speakers still allow both readings in these contexts. Cf. also example (166) below.

[10] In some Messinese varieties (Sicily), the *mi*-clause (Balkan-style subjucntive) does show the obviation effect; in cases of coreference, the canonical Romance infinitive is used (De Angelis 2017:139).

According to Landau, the division into C- and F-subjunctives is the same as the division into simultaneous and irrealis/future subjunctives. Indeed, when used with a different subject, tense mismatches are marginally possible:

(154) *?Încerc azi să veniți mâine dimineața la control.* [11]
     try.1SG today SA come.SBJV.2PL tomorrow morning to control
     ≈ 'I will try to make you a check-up appointment for tomorrow morning.'

(Ro.)

These verbs therefore do not constitute an exception to the classification proposed by Landau (2004).

     Given the division into two classes for both temporal and referential properties, we can say that there are thus two types of subjunctives with different degrees of finiteness but which do not show any difference in morphological marking, showing once more that morphological marking is not a reliable indication of the level of finiteness.

     Balkan-style subjunctives share a property with infinitives which is not attested with subjunctives in other Romance varieties [12], namely the fact that they allow subject raising. Consider the following examples from Romanian:

(155) a. *S-a nimerit ca toți băieții să fie bolnavi.*
       REFL=have.3SG happened that all boys.DET SA be.SBVJ3.PL sick
       'It happened that all the boys are/were sick.'
    b. *Toți băieții s-au nimerit să fie bolnavi.*
       all boys.DET REFL=have.3PL happened SA be.SBVJ3.PL sick
       'All the boys happened to be sick.'

(Ro., Grosu & Horvath 1984:351)

---

[11] This sentence could also be interpreted as an ellipsis:

  (i)   *Încerc azi (să văd ce pot face) să veniti mâine la control.*
       try.1SG today (SA see.1SG what can.1SG do.INF) SA come.SBJV.2PL tomorrow to control
       'I try today what I can do so that you can come tomorrow to a checkup.'

(Ro.)

[12] Hyperraising is also attested in BrPt:

  (i)   *As crianças parecem que gostam da babá.*
       the children seem.3PL that like.3PL of.the babysitter
       the children seem that like of.the babysitter

(BrPt., Fernández-Salgueiro 2008:302)

This phenomenon is called hyperraising. It consists of the raising of the subject out of a 'finite'/tensed complement, because the Balkan-style subjunctive is often considered a finite verb form given the presence of overt subject agreement on the embedded verb. Raising is traditionally thought not to be possible out of [+Tense] or [+Agr] complements. However, the data from Romanian above feature raising out of a clause with an agreeing verb. A raising verb such as *a se nimeri* 'to happen' selects a subjunctive complement. The raising of the subject is optional: the subject can occur both in the embedded clause (155a) or as in the matrix clause (155b). In the latter case, the subject agrees in person and number both with the matrix and the embedded verb.

Another property that the Balkan-style subjunctive shares with a subset of infinitives (i.e. restructuring infinitives) is clitic climbing, even if not all varieties allow it. Clitic climbing is found in northern Salentino in cases of *cu* drop (156). It is also attested in (colloquial) Romanian, although it is not accepted by all speakers (157). In Calabrian, on the other hand, clitic climbing is only possible when the lower copy of the clitic is also spelled out (158). This double spell-out is very frequent in spoken Romanian as well (cf. 157b):

(156) *Lu voli   ssapi.*
    it=want.3SG know.3SG
    'He wants to know it.'

               (Mesagne (BR), Ledgeway 2015:149)

(157) a. *Pe care o vrei să citeşti?*
     DOM which it=want.2SG SA you.read.SBJV.2SG
     'Which do you want to read?'

    b. *Le e   teamă că o vreau s-o abandonez.*
     to.them be.3SG fear   that her=want.1SG SA=her leave.SBJV.1SG
     'They are afraid that I want to leave her.'

    c. *Îi continui   să mănânci.*
     them=continue.2SG SA eat.SBJV.2SG
     'You continue to eat them.'

    d. *Inima   aproape îi încetează să bată.*
     heart.DET almost him=stop.3SG SA beat.SBJV.3SG
     'His heart almost stopped beating.'

                 (Ro., Ledgeway 2016b:8)

(158) a. *(U) provu m'u fazzu.*
     it=try.1SG MU=it do.1SG
    b. *(U) pozzu m'u fazzu.*

   it=can.1SG MU=it do.1SG

c. **(U) decidu m'u fazzu.*
   it=decide.1SG MU=it do.1SG

                     (SCal., Bova Marina (RC))

Clitic climbing can only take place with (a subset of) C-subjunctives, and never with the F-subjunctives (Ledgeway 2016b).

  In sum, this section has discussed how the subjunctive in Romanian, Salentino and Calabrian is not a homogenous category but has to be broken down into two types which differ in their degree of finiteness because they differ in their level of anchoring. C-subjunctives show obligatory control and anaphoric tense, whereas F-subjunctives have dependent tense and independent person. C-subjunctives are therefore equivalent to OC infinitives in other Romance languages, even though the presence of agreement morphology seems to indicate otherwise. F-subjunctives are more properly 'semi-finite', occupying an intermediate position between C-subjunctives and indicative complements.

8. Finiteness and clause size

Given the scalar nature of the notion of finiteness as discussed above, it is reasonable to expect that there are several ways in which non-finiteness or "less-finiteness" arises. Furthermore, there can be cross-linguistic variation in the locus of the features related to anchoring of both tense and person, which can but need not be morphologically expressed, complicating the picture of different degrees of finiteness. This section will discuss how the different levels of finiteness are the result of the presence or absence of functional heads in the clause, as well as what (morphosyntactic) features these can bear. A certain sequence of functional heads (including T and/or C) can be completely absent, leading to non-finiteness, or the clause can have the relevant C- and/or T-heads, which however are specified for indirect anchoring (Adger 2007:26–7), leading to semi-finiteness. We predict therefore that a reduction of functional structure will lead to a reduction of finiteness, as argued by Givón (1990), as well as Ledgeway (2007:363), who argues that there is an "iconic relationship between full semantic clausal autonomy and a matching full array of accessible functional projections. Attrition in the former is commensurately mirrored by a reduction in the latter". However, the reverse does not hold: a full clausal structure will not imply full finiteness, as the Fin head can anchor a clause both to the speech event and to a higher clause.

In fact, our conclusion from chapter 2 was that there is no absolute cross-linguistic correlation between finiteness and clause size, as both the non-finite complementisers AD and DE, as well as *mu* and *cu*, head different types of clauses.[13] They can lexicalise positions within the verbal domain (*v*P), the inflectional domain (IP) or the complementiser domain (CP), depending on the matrix verb that selects them. When a functional verb selects the infinitival or subjunctive complement, the infinitive or subjunctive verb will be lower than that functional projection. The less finite complementisers AD, DE, *mu* and *cu* are heads in the *v*-domain when subcategorised by root modals and lower aspectual predicates, whereas they encode a T-related head when subcategorised by epistemic/alethic modals, temporal and higher aspectual predicates, and finally, they lexicalise a C-related head when subcategorised by lexical control predicates (Ledgeway 2000:161ff.; 2013:fn.6; 2015a:157; 2016b:1014–15; Cinque 2004:165; Tortora 2014:147–8; Taylor 2014; Squillaci 2016:160–2). This is exemplified for Standard Italian in (159) and for southern Calabrian in (160):

(159) a. *Dichiarò [CP di [TP essersi [VP innamorato]]].*
      declare.PRET.3SG of   be.INF=REFL fallen.in.love
      'He declared that he had fallen in love.'

    b. *Cercai   [IP di non [vP sbagliare   strada]].*
      try.PRET.1SG   of NEG   err.INF   street
      'I tried not to take the wrong road.'

    c. *Lo finimmo   [vP di mangiare]*
      it=finish.PRET.1PL   of eat.INF
      'We finished eating it.'

                                                         (It.)

(160) a. *Speramu [CP armenu u focu nomm'u   ddumanu   stasira].*
      wish.1PL   at.least the fire   NEG=MU=it light.3PL   tonight
      'Let's hope that they don't light the bonfire at least tonight.'

                                          (Squillaci 2016:163)

    b. *Cercu   sempri [IP   nommi fumu].*
      try.1SG always   NEG=MU smoke.1SG
      'I always try not to smoke.'

    c. *Finiscinu   [vP m'u mbivinu].*

---

[13] See for similar conclusions Cyrino & Sheehan (to appear), who show that causative and perception verbs select phasal *v*P complements in English, but TP in Brazilian Portuguese.

it=finish.3PL MU=it drink.3PL

'They finish drinking it.'

Thus, infinitives and Balkan-style subjunctives do not represent one structure. Instead, their structure depends on the matrix verb selecting the complement: when selected by a control verb such as *ammettere,* the complement is a CP; with restructuring verbs such as *provare a* 'try' or *finire di* 'finish', the complement is reduced and consists of a TP or *v*/VP respectively. The exception here, as seen in chapter 2, is Romanian: complements headed by *(ca ..) să* are always CPs. There are thus several ways in which a clause can be less or non-finite.

8.1 *v*/VP-sized complements

As discussed in §2.2 above, in case of restructuring, a functional verb is directly inserted into the I-domain in a functional head and a lexical infinitive into the V-domain (Cinque 2004; 2006). This is a necessarily monoclausal structure: the 'embedded' infinitival verb does not constitute a clause on its own. All cases of exhaustive subject control can be analysed as cases of restructuring where the 'control' verb is nothing more than a functional verb directly merged into the I-domain and taking a lexical verb in the VP as its complement (Cinque 2004; 2006; Grano 2015).

The fact that the infinitive does not constitute a clause on its own readily explains the obligatory anaphoric nature of both Tense and Person and the absence of (in)dependent anchoring. The lexical infinitive simply lacks a separate anchoring point (viz. Fin) and is therefore obligatorily anaphoric to the functional verb. Similarly, these functional verbs act like raising verbs as they do not assign theta-roles to their subject but agree with and raise the infinitival subject.[14] The subject of the functional verb is the raised subject of the lexical verb.

Restructuring not only happens with morphologically 'non-finite' verbs such as infinitives, but is also found with Balkan-style subjunctives. In case of Calabrian *mu* clauses and Salentino *cu* clauses,[15] the structure is arguably still monoclausal. This is shown by transparency effects (the possibility of clitic climbing or doubling, the licensing of NPIs etc.), as discussed in chapter 2. What distinguishes these subjunctives from the infinitive is the morphological realisation of agreement on the lower verb. We can therefore posit the presence of two ɸ-probes in the clause, one in the T-domain, yielding agreement on the functional verb, and one in the V-domain, leading to morphological agreement with the subject on the lower verb. Note however that both probes

---

[14] They can still be subject-oriented, see Grano (2015:chap. 3) for discussion, which makes them look like control verbs in the sense that they seem to impose restrictions on the possible subject (unlike classical raising verbs).

[15] Romanian *să*-clauses are FinPs, cf. chapter 2. See section 8.3 for discussion of these.

agree with the same argument, viz. the subject; they cannot probe on their own but the φ-features are copied down from the higher probe. I assume here, following Ouali (2008), that the C-head DONATEs the φ-features to T which in turn SHAREs them with a lower head in the V-domain, leading to morphological agreement on both the restructuring and lexical verb.

The complements to restructuring verbs constitute the extreme case of non-finiteness because they do not head a separate clause with a functional domain, but share the functional structure with the restructuring verb. They are not anchored for Tense or Person separately from the matrix verb but they share the relevant features. The apparent complementisers introducing the lexical verb in these contexts have to be located in the V- or low I-domain, and are definitely not C-elements (although they may derive historically from C-related elements, cf. discussion in chapter 3). They can be phasal, however, depending on whether the verb is transitive or not. This will not influence the finiteness of the clause.

8.2 TP-sized complements

Certain types of (higher) functional verbs, i.e. *provare a* 'try to' and higher alethic modals, select complements that are bigger than just vPs. However, being restructuring verbs, they still select for simultaneous and exhaustive subject control (which is the result of subject raising). Their derivation is thus parallel to the cases described above in §8.1. Lacking a Fin head which anchors the event, the lower verb will have the same tense and subject interpretation (and the t(-ense) and φ-features) of the functional verb. However, since these complements have more functional structure, they can embed negation as well:

(161) *Cercai   [TP di non [VP sbagliare strada]].*
      try.PRET.1SG   of NEG   err.INF   street
      'I tried not to take the wrong road.'

(It.)

Raising verbs are verbs that lack theta-roles but which take a clausal complement with reduced functional structure; the embedded subject thus raises to the matrix subject position for case reasons. Although their complements are reduced, they have more structure than restructuring infinitives; they allow for past tense auxiliaries and negation:

(162) *Gianni sembra   non   aver   capito   niente.*
      Gianni seem.3SG   NEG   have.INF understood nothing
      'Gianni seems not to have understood anything.'

(It.)

In the absence of a perfective auxiliary, the tense of raising complements is however necessarily simultaneous to the matrix verb.

Unlike control verbs, however, infinitival complements to raising verbs do not have a left periphery (Rizzi 1997:309); compare the raising use of *sembrare* 'seem' in (163) with the control use in (164):

(163) **?Gianni sembra   il tuo libro,   conoscerlo   bene.*
     Gianni   seem.3SG   the your book, know.INF=it well
     'Gianni seems to know your book well.'

(164) *Mi sembra,   il tuo libro,   di PRO   conoscerlo   bene.*
     to.me= seem.3SG   the your book of PRO   know.INF=it   well
     'I think I know you book well.'

                                    (It., Rizzi 1997:309)

Generally, no complementisers are used with raising verbs, which has led people to assume that there is no CP, and thus no higher phase head (Kayne 1984; Watanabe 1996: 26ff.; Rizzi 1997; but cf. Rooryck 2000 who argues for a CP analysis of raising complements). This would explain why A-movement out of the infinitival complement is possible. In fact, in Italian the difference between the raising use of *sembrare* 'seem' and the control verb *sembrare* 'seem' is marked by the absence and presence of the complementiser *di*, which is only present in the case of the control interpretation (164) but is necessarily absent in the raising construction (163). Furthermore, the absence of the C-head(s) explains the absence of independent tense features and ϕ-features and thus the absence of inflection and forced simultaneous tense. The embedded subject moves to the main clause for case. Complements to raising verbs are thus less finite because of the lack of the C-domain, which leads to anaphoric tense and person. However, the presence of functional structure allows for perfective auxiliaries.

In Romanian, raising complements do not seem to be reduced but to be full CPs with a left periphery that can be activated:

(165) a. *Toţi băietii   s-au   nimerit   (*ca) să fie   bolnavi.*
       all boys=DET   REFL=have.3PL happened   that   SA be.SBJV.3PL sick
       'All the boys happened to be sick.'

    b. *S-a   nimerit   ca   toţi băietii   să fie   bolnavi.*
       REFL=have.3SG happened   that all boys=DET   SA be.SBVJ.3PL sick
       'It happened that all the boys are/were sick.'

(Ro., Grosu & Horvath 1984:351)

(166) *Toţi băietii   s-au   nimerit   ca   fix   la cursul   meu să*
      all boys.DET   REFL= have happened   that exactly at course.DET mine SA
      fie   bolnavi.
      be.SBJV.3SG ill
      'All the boys happened to be sick exactly at my course.'

(Ro.)

This confirms our conclusion from chapter 2 that *să*-clauses are CPs with *să* appearing in Fin. They do not however block A-movement, as they are defective phases, showing [indirect] anchoring. They will be discussed in the next section.

8.3 CPs/full clauses

Whereas the absence of the C- and/or T-domain implies a lesser degree of finiteness and thus a greater degree of dependency for anchoring of person and tense, the reverse does not hold. A full structure including the C-domain does not imply that the clause will be fully finite. Instead, the feature specification of the relevant functional heads can lead to indirect anchoring of person or tense and thus to a lesser degree of finiteness.

For clarity, let us start with fully finite root sentences. These project a fully-fledged C-domain (in case of activation of the left periphery) or a syncretic C (in case of no discourse-related movement to the left periphery (Rizzi 1997:314)). The Fin-head links both tense and person directly to the speech act (an external logophoric centre, in Bianchi's (2003) terms) and the relevant features, namely t(ense)-features and φ-features are DONATEd to the T-domain, where they are morphologically expressed on the verb. Similarly, indicative complements are directly anchored in their Fin head but they are selected by a higher predicate. In this case, as in matrix clauses, t(ense)-features and φ-features are DONATEd to the T-head. The complementiser *che* is ambiguous with respect to (in)direct anchoring and expresses a mere subordination relation. In the varieties with a specific indicative complementiser (Ro. *că*, SIDs *ca/chi*), the complementiser marks direct anchoring.

There are different types of fully clausal complements, which can be classified based on their level of factivity and assertivity (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1968; Hooper & Thompson 1973). This correlates with different sizes of complementisers in nanosyntactic approaches (Baunaz 2015; Baunaz & Lander 2018) or the heaviness of the phasal edge (Sheehan & Hinzen 2011), which results in different degrees of opacity. Some of these complements (factives, semi-factives, cf.

167a) are islands whereas others are not (167b) (Sheehan & Hinzen 2011; Baunaz 2015; Baunaz & Lander 2018):

(167) a. **Comment   est-ce   que   Jean se rappelle   que   Jules prend   la photo*?
      how   be.3SG=it that Jean REFL=remember.3SG   that Jules take.3SG   the picture
      'How is it that Jean remembers Jules takes a picture?'

    b. *Comment   est-ce   que   Paul dit/prétend que Roger   a   gagné le*
      how   be.3SG=it   that Paul say/claim   that Roger have.3SG won the
      tournoi?
      tournament
      'How does Paul say/claim that Roger has won the tournament?'

<div align="right">(Fr., Baunaz 2015:198,200)</div>

There is furthermore a difference in whether they can display root phenomena such as topicalisation (Hooper & Thompson 1973; Sheehan & Hinzen 2011). Some of these indicative complements are thus more embedded than others in that they disallow root transformations. This has no influence however on the anchoring of person and tense, which is completely independent in all cases, and thus it does not interfere with levels of finiteness under the present approach.

    A potential problem for the proposed analysis is that certain finite complements also present some dependency effects. First, indicative clauses can show sequence of tense effects (Zagona 1990; Stowell 1993; cited in Ambar 2017), but, as argued by Ambar (2017: 139), these restrictions are less strong than with subjunctives or other less finite verbs. Second, embedded indicatives can show a phenomenon similar to obviation when the embedded subject is expressed with a pronoun in a pro-drop language:

(168) *Gianni$_i$ dice   che   lui$_{?i/j}$ parte.*
     Gianni say.3SG that   he   leaves
     'Gianni says that he leaves.'

<div align="right">(It.)</div>

(169) *Jim andrà   se (*lui)   si sentirà   bene.*
     Jim go.FUT.3SG if he   RELF=feel.FUT   well
     'Jim will go if he will feel well.'

<div align="right">(It., Frascarelli 2007:695)</div>

However, this seems part of a broader discourse effect that is also found between two finite clauses (Frascarelli 2007); the use of an overt pronoun in pro-drop languages is usually employed for topic-shift and this is not an effect of the embedding of the indicative complement. Second, the coreferential reading, although maybe not preferred, is not impossible. I conclude therefore that this is not strictly obviation but a broader discourse-related effect, which is not caused by indirect anchoring of Person.

With regards to indirectly anchored but clausal complements, we note that also here there are many different types, including 'standard' subjunctives, Balkan-style subjunctives and infinitival complements. The derivations of each of these types with relevant features will now briefly be discussed.

Lexical control verbs select for infinitival clausal complements, which present all three domains: C-, I- and *v*-related heads. As discussed above, many control verbs have a dependent tense, namely a future/irrealis tense. This has been taken as proof of the presence of the T-head (Stowell 1982), or of the *woll* modal (Wurmbrand 2014). Further evidence for the presence of functional structure above the *v*P is that these complements can be independently negated:

(170) *Decido   di (non) andare.*
      decide.1SG   of NEG   go.INF
      'I decide not to go.'

                                                                                    (It.)

That they include a C-domain as well is evidenced by the potential activation of the left periphery where both topics (171) and foci (172) can appear:

(171) a. *Ritengo,   a Gianni,   di potergli   parlare.*
         believe.1SG   to Gianni,   of be.able.INF=to.him speak.INF
         'Gianni, I think I can speak to him.'
    b. *Gianni pensa,   il tuo libro,   di conoscerlo   bene.*
       Gianni think.3SG   the your book of know.INF=it well
        'Gianni thinks he knows it well, your book.'

                                                           (It., Rizzi 1997:309-10)

(172) a. *Giulia decidə   'e servì   O VVINU RUSSƏ,   nu   chillu ianchə.*
         Giulia decide.3SG of serve.INF the wine red   NEG   that white
    b. *ᵗGiulia decidə   O VVINU RUSSƏ   'e servì, nu   chillu ianche.*
       Giulia decide.3SG   the wine red   of serve.INF NEG   that white
       'Giulia decides to serve the red wine, not the white one.'

c. *O VVINU RUSSƏ*   *Giulia a*   *decis*   *'e servì,*   *nu*   *chillu ianchə.*

the wine red   Giulia have.3SG   decided   of serve.INF NEG   that   white

'Giulia decides to serve the red wine, not the white one.'

(SIDs, Airola (BN))

The C-domain contains the anchoring to the matrix predicate in terms of person ([indirect: -coin] obviation and partial control) as well as Tense ([indirect: -coin] future-oriented, limited by the matrix event). This indirect anchoring is expressed on Fin in the morphological form of the complementiser (AD, DE). There are no ɸ-features phonologically realised but a subject[16] is licensed, necessarily including (but not only) the matrix subject. Furthermore, the tense features, although not morphologically expressed, are donated from C to T. They are valued through Fin, the locus of the anchoring to the matrix clause via predicate valuation.

Moving on to 'standard Romance' subjunctives, I adopt the view that these also project up to the C-domain. However, like control infinitives, they form a defective phase and are characterised by dependent Tense or Person anchoring. Unlike control complements, subjunctive complements are equipped with a set of morphologically expressed ɸ-features. However, this does not make them a complete phase as it is still tense-defective (Gallego 2007; Ambar 2018). Their person anchoring is restricted by the matrix clause in a different way than with control infinitives because rather than a need to include the matrix subject, they have a restriction on their subject as *not* including the matrix subject. The fact that predicate valuation for both tense and person anchoring can take place, shows that the subjunctive CPs are weak/defective phases (Gallego 2015:27). If they were strong phases, they would not be accessible to the matrix anchoring head (Fin), which is located two phases (*v* and C) higher than the embedded Fin. The status of subjunctives as weak phases accounts for the various transparency effects found with subjunctive complements which are not found with indicative complements (cf. §6.1).

The complementiser *che* is located in the C-domain (Fin/Force, depending on the variety, see discussion below). This same position (Fin) is also targeted by verb movement of subjunctives in case of complementiser-drop (Poletto 2001), as can be seen in (173), where the HAS adverb has to follow the verb:

(173) *Credo*   *(*sicuramente) lo faccia*   *sicuramente.*

believe.1SG surely   it=do.SBJV.3SG   surely

'I believe that he will surely do it.'

---

[16] The embedded subject can be analysed both as PRO or a copy of the moved DP (Hornstein 1999; Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes 2010), an issue that will be left aside here.

(It.)

Complementiser-drop is only possible with a modally marked clauses, with the verb in the subjunctive, future or conditional (Giorgi & Pianesi 1996:152, Poletto 2001).

Within CPs there is also a difference as to whether the left periphery is activated or whether there is a syncretic C$_{force-fin}$ (Giorgi & Pianesi 1996; Rizzi 1997:314). With regards to the activation of the left periphery, Gallego (2010:202-3) notes that topicalisation and focus fronting is readily available in Spanish main and embedded indicative clauses (174a, 175a), but not with subjunctives (174b; 175b). Similar results are reported for Cosentino subjunctives, which do not allow hanging topics (177a), scene-setting adverbs (177b), CLLD (177c), or foci (177d) in their left periphery, in contrast with indicative complements (176):

(174) a. *Aristóteles   creía   que, en cuanto   a la Tragedia, debía*
         Aristotle   believe.IPFV.3SG   that as how.much to the Tragedy must.IPFV.3SG
         haber   tres   unidades.
         have.INF   three units
         'Aristotle thought that, as far Tragedy was concerned, there must be three units.'

     b. **Aristóteles quería   que, en cuanto   a la   Tragedia,   hubiera*
         Aristotle   want.IPFV.3SG that, as how.much   to the Tragedy   have.SBJV.IPFV.3SG
         tres   unidades
         three units
         'Aristotle wanted that, as far as Tragedy was concerned, there would be there units.'

                                                                 (Sp., Gallego 2010:203)

(175) a. *Juan dijo   que muchas cosas había   visto!*
         Juan say.PRET.3SG   that many   things have.IPFV.3SG seen
         'Juan said that many things he had seen!'

     b. **Juan quería   que   muchas   cosas viera!*
         Juan want.IPFV.3SG that   many   things see.SBJV.PST.3SG
         'Juan wanted to see many things!'

                                                                 (Sp., Gallego 2010:203)

(176) a. *Dicia   ca   Mariu unn'u parra   cchiù   nullu.*
         say.3SG   that   Mariu not him=speak.3SG   no.more nobody
         'He says that Mario, nobody talks to him anymore.'

     b. *Dicia   ca   doppu   'a guerra papà unn'era   cchiù 'u stessu.*

say.3SG   that   after   the war dad   NEG be.IPFV.3SG more the same

'He says that after the war dad was not the same anymore.'

c. *Dicia   ca   'e mulingiane unn' 'e   vo   cchiù.*

say.3SG that   the aubergines NEG them want.3SG   more

'He says that he does not want anymore aubergines.'

d. *Dicia   ca   CICCIU   sgarra   (nun Micheluzzu).*

say.3SG that   Cicciu   err.3SG   NEG Micheluzzu

'He says that Cicciu is making a mistake, not Micheluzzu.'

<div align="right">(Cos., Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014:42)</div>

(177) a. **Vuogliu   ca   Mariu unn'u   parra   cchiù nullu.*

want.1SG   that   Mario NEG=him   talk.3SG   more nobody

'I want that Mario, nobody talks to him anymore.'

b. **Vuonnu   ca   doppu a festa   mangiamu.*

want.3PL   that   after the party eat.1PL

'They want for us to eat after the party.'

c. **Vulissa   ca   'u canciellu u cunzassaru.*

want.COND.1SG that   the fence   it=fix.SBJV.IPFV.3PL

'I would like that they fix the fence.'

d. **Vulìa   ca   NA BELLA SAGNA priparassa   (nun nu purpettune).*

want.IPFV.1SG that   a nice lasagne prepare.SBJV.PST.3SG NEG a meatloaf

'I wanted that he prepared a nice lasagne, not a meatloaf.'

<div align="right">(Cos., Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014:42)</div>

The same data are replicated for Mussomelese (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014:43). These data show that even in the absence of a specific dedicated complementiser for irrealis/subjunctive complements, there is a difference in the availability of the left periphery between realis and irrealis clauses.

Some other varieties, however, do allow CLLD in subjunctive complements. Witness the following Italian example:

(178) *Vorrei   che   il giorno, Ugo non l'avesse   sbagliato.*

want.COND.1SG that   the day   Ugo NEG it=have.SBJV.IPFV.3SG mistaken

'I would like Ugo to not haven got the day wrong.'

<div align="right">(It., Ledgeway 2016b:1013)</div>

Kempchinsky (2008, cited in (Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2014) maintains that CLLD is allowed in subjunctive complements, unlike contrastive focus fronting or hanging topics. This would mean that the availability of the left periphery is still reduced in some way. The exact realisation (syncretic or not) of the subjunctive C is thus subject to variation across Romance.

For the Balkan-style subjunctive, we need to make a distinction between Salentino and southern Calabrian on the one hand, as they vary in size, and Romanian on the other, which are consisently CPs. In Salentino and southern Calabrian, subjunctives that are CPs can be analysed very similarly to the 'standard Romance' subjunctives and lexical control infinitives. They have a Fin head, marked for [indirect: -coin] tense. The main difference with both the lexical control infinitives and the standard Romance subjunctives is the absence of a restriction on the possible subject, as we do not find the obviation effect. Their anchoring of Person is thus [deictic]. Finally, differently from the standard Romance subjunctive, the Balkan-style subjunctive allows the activation of the left periphery in all varieties studied.

As concluded in chapter 2, Romanian subjunctives are always CPs, and do not differ in size as their Calabrian and Salentino counterparts do, even when they are selected by the functional verbs that are restructuring verbs in other Romance languages. However, although formally restructuring does not occur, the results in terms of anchoring are the same as in other Romance languages when they are selected by functional verbs: there is obligatorily simultaneous tense and obligatory coreference between matrix and embedded subjects. Here, I assume that *să* in this case is a Fin head with the anchoring specified as [indirect: +coin] for Tense and [indirect: +coin] for Person due to selection by a functional verb. Conversely, when selected by a lexical verb, Romanian subjunctives are anchored indirectly for Tense but directly for Person, like the CP-sized subjunctives in southern Calabrian and Salentino.

8.4 Non-embedded less finite forms

As discussed above, less finite forms can also be used as main clauses. There are two main types, namely the modal uses of such forms (subjunctives and infinitives) and a declarative/assertive use. The latter is the case with so-called narrative infinitives, which head a declarative, often past tense, clause. Their use is limited to written, formal registers. An example is given in (179), repeated from (7):

(179) *Marie est venue et Jean de partir.*
   Marie be.3SG come and Jean of leave.INF
   'Marie has come and Jean has left.'

<div align="right">(Fr., Nikolaeva 2007b:153)</div>

In this case, neither person nor tense is expressed morphologically, but the information can be retrieved from the context. A nominative subject can however be licensed, which indicates the direct anchoring of person. The tense interpretation is usually past.

Non-finite forms used in main clauses to express modal meanings are much more frequent in Romance. Often they are used to expresses wishes, commands or exclamations:

(180) a. *Comprem   eles   o livro!*
       buy.SBJV.3PL   they   the book
       'That they buy the book! And can study!'

  b. *(Que) venham as chuvas!*
       that   come.3.PL.SBJV the rains
       'May the rain come!'

(EuPt., Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017:3)

(181) a. *Si accommodi,   per favore.*
       REFL=settle.SBJV.3SG   please
       'Sit down, please.'

  b. *(Che) la   forza sia   con te.*
       that   the   force be.SBJV.3SG   with you
       'May the force be with you.'

  c. *Non l'avessi   mai   fatto!*
       NEG it=had.SBJV.1SG   never   done
       'I wish I had never done it!'

(It.)

(182) a. *Non andare là!*
       NEG go.INF   there
       'Don't go there!'

  b. *Io, andarci   da sola?!*
       I   go.INF=LOC   of alone
       'Me, going there on my own?!'

(It.)

All these uses have in common that the event is not realised; they express *irrealis* values. The event is thus not anchored directly to the real world, but through a modal operator anchored to a (set of) alternative world(s). This modal operator has been assumed to be located in Fin; in modally

marked uses, Fin contains an anchoring point to a hypothetical world. The Fin head is optionally endowed with morphologically expressed φ-features, and morphological tense features in case of a subjunctive. These morphological features are absent in infinitives (with the exception of inflected infinitives, which bear only φ-features).

In most cases, the verb is interpreted as unrealised (future). However, the wish can also be expressed with respect to the past (181c). In this case, the result is a counterfactual interpretation, as the event is not only unrealised, but cannot be realised anymore either. Tense is thus deictic (allowing future and past interpretation, interpreted with respect to the moment of speech). Person, as well, seems to be directly anchored: a 1st person is interpreted as the speaker, whereas a 2nd person is interpreted as the Addressee, and there are no restrictions on the possible subjects. Obviation or control is not attested in root contexts.

Although both indicative and subjunctive main clauses feature deictic anchoring, this special modal use of non-finite forms in main clauses differs from indicative main clauses in terms of to which world the event is anchored, the real or imagined world.

9. Conclusion

In this chapter, it has been argued on the basis of Romance data that finiteness is not a linguistic primitive, but has different manifestations at various levels of the grammar. Morphologically, finiteness cannot be defined cross-linguistically. Syntactically, finiteness manifests itself in the presence of an overt lexical subject, in independent tense, and in the opacity of the clause. Semantically, a finite clause is autonomous and possesses an illocutionary force. It has been shown that there are many mismatches between these levels, in the sense that morphological marking is not a reliable indicator for syntactic or semantic finiteness. A purely morphological definition therefore needs to be rejected.

The central proposal of this chapter has been that finiteness has to be interpreted as anchoring of Tense and Person. These two properties can be anchored directly or indirectly. Being syntactically finite is taken to mean that the clause is directly anchored to the speech act; non-finiteness or less-finiteness arises when the anchoring takes place via predicate valuation, viz. the clause is anchored through the matrix clause. In the latter case there are two further options: indirectly anchored clauses can be anaphoric to another clause, or restricted in their interpretation by another clause. The combination of these degrees leads to a scalar view of (non-)finiteness. Syntactic finiteness has consequences for possible interpretations in terms of tense and the person of the subject; the anchoring properties of the head Fin thus have semantic effects.

Rather than in the IP, I argue that these distinctions originate in the C-domain, which interfaces with the clause above or with the speech act, or more specifically, in the position called

Fin (cf. Rizzi 1997), which interfaces with the I-domain. Whenever the C-domain is absent, there is no independent anchoring available. The relevant features can be shared however with the I-domain (Chomsky 2004; Ouali 2008).

Table 5.4 Degrees of finiteness

Anchoring		Indirectly anchored (predicate valuation) [-direct]		Deictically anchored [direct]
		Anaphoric tense [+coin]	**Restricted tense [-coin]**	**Independent tense [+/-coin]**
Indirectly anchored (predicate valuation) [-direct]	**Anaphoric person [+coin]**	EC with infinitive and Balkan subj [PROTOTYPICAL NON-FINITE]	Controlled complements after 'promise', 'want'	Epistemic/declarative with infinitival complements
	Restricted person [-coin]		Subjunctive complements to desideratives	Subjunctive complements to factive verbs
Deictically anchored [direct]	**Independent person [+/-coin]**		Other subjunctives Personal and inflected infinitives	Indicative clauses [PROTOTYPICAL FINITE]

It has been shown that subjunctives, inflected infinitives and Balkan-style subjunctives occupy an intermediate position on the scale of finiteness. Modal forms are less finite than indicative ones. In fact, it has been proposed that non-finiteness and mood are two sides of the same coin (Vincent 1998). Non-finite and subjunctive events have in common that they are not directly anchored to the speech act, but anchored indirectly or to another possible world.

Elaborating further the conclusions of chapter 2, I have argued that there is no one-to-one correspondence between clause size and finiteness. A reduced clause will automatically be less-finite but a full clause can be less- or non-finite. Similarly, there seems to be no absolute correspondence between phasality and finiteness. Less-finite CPs are non-phasal, as they need to remain accessible to the matrix predicate for predicate valuation. However, the phasality of a *v*P-sized complement does not seem to influence the finiteness of the complement.

Finally, it should be noted that there is no direct relation between finiteness and embedding. Although non-finite/lesser finite forms typically occur in embedded contexts, they can also occur in root contexts, albeit with a specific modal reading. Conversely, finite clauses can be embedded. There is only a one-way implication in terms of finiteness and clause size. Reduced clauses will result in a reduced degree of finiteness/direct anchoring but the opposite is not true: a clause can have all three domains (C-, T- and *v*/V-domain) but still be indirectly anchored and thus not completely finite.

6. Conclusions

Finiteness has traditionally been defined as a binary opposition between inflected and non-inflected verbs (cf. chapter 1). However, this morphological view runs into problems in Romance, where many clause types cannot be readily classified as either finite or non-finite, such as the personal and inflected infinitives, as well as the Balkan-style subjunctives. The main research question of this dissertation has focused on the nature of finiteness as emerging from data from Romance languages. How do these intermediate forms fit in a finite – non-finite continuum? What are its reflexes at a (morpho)syntactic level?

The present dissertation has argued, on the basis of Romance data, that finiteness is not a linguistic primitive (despite proposals regarding functional heads such as Fin(iteness), cf. Rizzi 1997), but has different manifestations at various levels of the grammar. Morphologically, finiteness cannot be defined cross-linguistically (and not even across Romance), as its reflexes are subject to cross-linguistic variation. Syntactically, finiteness manifests itself as the presence of an overt lexical subject, independent tense, and the opacity of the clause (related to the phasality of the clause). However, it has been shown that these are not without exceptions. Semantically, a finite clause is autonomous and possesses an illocutionary force. There are many mismatches between these levels, in the sense that morphological marking is not a reliable indicator for syntactic or semantic finiteness. Moreover, in certain cases (e.g. the inflected infinitive), morphological marking is optional or completely lost, without consequences for the syntax. A purely morphological definition therefore needs to be rejected.

The main proposal put forward in this dissertation is that finiteness should be reinterpreted as anchoring of Tense and Person. These two properties of a clause can be anchored directly or indirectly. In the former case, Tense is deictic and Person is free; in the latter case, both person and tense interpretation can be anaphoric to or restricted by another clause. The two anchoring processes (for Tense and Person) can act independently, but are not completely equal: if Tense is anaphoric, Person must also be. The combination of these degrees for both anchoring processes leads to a scalar view of finiteness. Being syntactically finite is taken to mean that the clause is directly anchored to the speech act; non-finiteness or less-finiteness arises whenever the anchoring takes place via predicate valuation (Ritter & Wiltschko 2014), viz. the clause is anchored by another clause. This syntactic finiteness has consequences for possible interpretations in terms of tense and the reference of the subject. The anchoring properties of the Fin head thus have semantic effects. It has been shown that subjunctives, inflected infinitives and Balkan-style subjunctives occupy an intermediate position on the scale of finiteness, as they often present restrictions in terms of tense and subject interpretation.

These anchoring distinctions originate in the C-domain, which interfaces with the clause above or with the speech act, or more specifically, in the position called *Fin* (cf. Rizzi 1997), which interfaces with the I-domain. Although they originate in the C-domain, the relevant features can be shared with or donated to functional heads in the I-domain (Chomsky 2004; Ouali 2008). Whenever the C-domain is absent, there is no independent anchoring available. There are thus several structural ways in which clauses can be non-finite. A certain sequence of functional heads (including T and/or C) can be completely absent, leading to non-finiteness, or the clause can have the relevant C- and/or T-heads, which are however specified for indirect anchoring (Adger 2007:26–7), leading to semi-finiteness. It is predicted therefore that a reduction of functional structure will lead to a reduction of finiteness (Givón 1990; Ledgeway 2007:363). However, the reverse does not hold: a full clausal structure does not imply full finiteness, as the Fin head can anchor a clause not only to the speech event, but also to a higher clause. There is thus no absolute correlation between clause size and finiteness. There is also no one-to-one correspondence between finiteness and phasality: finite clauses are usually phasal CPs; however, non-finite clauses can be phases (e.g. subjunctives, which are defective phases, or *v*P-sized infinitives), or not (e.g. complements to raising verbs are TPs). It seems however that only completely finite clauses are non-defective CP-phases.

This is confirmed by the results of chapter 2, where the correlation between different degrees of finiteness and the amount of functional structure in a clause were investigated. Although infinitival complementisers AD/DE, SCal. *mu/ma/mi* and Salentino *cu* head differently sized clauses depending on the matrix verb selecting them, the same is not true for their Romanian counterpart *să.* The Romanian irrealis complementiser behaves similarly to USID *che/chi* in that it always heads a CP (with at least Fin). The fact that in Romanian all *să*-complements are of the same size but nonetheless show differences in the level of finiteness, is unexpected given the uniformity principle (Chomsky 2001). One would expect that irrealis non-finite structures selected by a certain class of matrix verbs correspond to the same structures cross-linguistically, contrary to fact. This leads to two major conclusions: irrealis subordinators are a spurious category, heading different functional projections along the clausal spine; and moreover, finiteness does not correlate with clause size, as non-finite complements can be *v*Ps, TPs or CPs. The same functional verb can select a smaller complement in Salentino or Southern Calabrian, but a CP in Romanian. Similarly, a verb like *a putea* 'to be able' can select both a *v*P and CP complement (Nicolae 2016). Other studies that confirm this result, i.e. that the same functional verb can select different sizes of complement within and across languages, include Ledgeway (2012b; 2015a), who argues for northern Salentino that in case of *cu*-drop, the complement is IP rather than CP. Similarly, Sheehan & Cyrino (to appear) show that causative and perception verbs select phasal *v*P complements in English, but TP in Brazilian Portuguese.

Focusing on the position of the verb in non- and less-finite clauses, the overall finding is that there is a commonality to the syntax of less- and non-finite verbs despite morphological differences: all target a high clausal position at the edge of IP, close to CP, in all Romance languages studied. We find thus a thoroughly different movement pattern than in finite indicative forms, where Romance languages differ in the position targeted by the verb (Schifano 2018). The pattern instead resembles more the high placement of the subjunctive. There is no difference in verb movement between finite and non-finite forms in the traditional definition; subjunctives instead pattern with infinitives, gerunds etc. in their high verb movement. This movement is caused by the need for all these verbs to be anchored by the higher predicate, as they are all less finite. For the indirect anchoring to take place, the verb needs to move to Fin (as in Aux-to-Comp), or, whenever a complementiser is located in Fin, the verb needs to be its direct complement so that the verb and the anchoring head Fin can be in a local relationship. The movement to satisfy this requirement in case of indirect anchoring has consequences for the subject position in some of these clauses: the canonical preverbal subject position is not available. This is the case with the personal infinitive, the Sardinian inflected infinitive, the Balkan-style subjunctive, and the gerund.

With regard to changes in finiteness, the rise of the dual complementiser systems attested in Romanian, Southern Calabrian and Salentino is informative, because here the irrealis subordinator has also replaced many uses of the canonical Romance infinitive. It has been argued that Sal. *cu* and SCal. *mu*, contrary to traditional views, both derive from the same etymon, viz. QUOMODO 'how'. Given the Latin evidence and the similarities between Calabrese *mu* and Salentino *cu*, this seems a more convincing etymology for these particles than the generally accepted MODO and QUOD respectively. Ro. *să* on the other hand, derives from the merger of the conditional complementiser SI and the purposive complementiser SI(C). The grammaticalisation of these different irrealis markers has shown that, although they form a heterogeneous category and derive from different etyma, there is a general pattern in their diachrony: they all grammaticalise downwards (*pace* Roberts & Roussou 2003). They typically derive from high C-heads, which move towards the lowest position of the C-domain, viz. *Fin*, which is the locus of the anchoring of the clause. The irrealis complementisers all have in common that they mark indirect anchoring of the clause. *Cu* and *mu,* contrary to Ro. *să,* subsequently grammaticalise further down, to head complements to functional verbs, on a par with reflexes of AD and DE.

At first glance, there seems to have been a change in the degree of finiteness in these languages, since the infinitival structures have been replaced with seemingly finite structures (the so-called *impopolarità dell'infinito* 'the impopularity of the infinitive' (Rohlfs 1969:102-106)). The Balkan-style subjunctive is indeed more finite under a traditional morphological view of finiteness (cf. discussion in chapter 1), but on a syntactic level, the Balkan-style subjunctive is as finite as an infinitival complement, depending on the matrix verb selecting it. So, even if a morphologically

non-finite form like the infinitive is replaced by a morphologically more finite form (i.e. the subjunctive), these properties of the complement clause do not change, as they ultimately depend on the matrix verb selecting the clause in question, and we do not have an increase in the degree of *syntactic* finiteness. This confirms once more that morphology is not a reliable indicator of finiteness.

The results of this dissertation raise questions more generally about the syntax-semantics interface. It has been shown that the same semantics need not be mapped onto the same syntactic structure. The same functional verbs can select different sizes of complements without leading to changes in its finiteness or semantics. It thus seems that inactivation of present functional structure or complete absence of functional structure does not lead to any difference at LF (*pace* Cinque 1999). This is particularly problematic for the cartographic approach, because it is assumed that the sequence of functional heads is universal, and partly determined through semantics (Cinque & Rizzi 2015:77). The different realisations of the complement to a modal like 'can' constitute a problem for cartographic enterprises because the same semantics does not map onto the same structure. It has been concluded therefore that non-finite clauses can be CPs which contain a series of inaccessible heads, rendering them less finite, as is the case in Romanian *să*-clauses. I thus conclude that the strongest cartographic hypothesis, according to which all projections are always projected and that there is a one-to-one isomorphic mapping between syntax and semantics, is too strong.

There are a few issues that remain points for further research. The first concerns the role of morphology, which I have considered to be an unreliable indicator of finiteness. The question arises how children acquire the distinction between direct and indirect anchoring, if morphology provides misleading clues. Another point that needs to be investigated further is the role between mood/modality and finiteness. Modal forms in Romance, such as the subjunctive, are less finite than indicative ones. In fact, it has been proposed that non-finiteness and mood are two sides of the same coin (Vincent 1998). I have proposed that non-finite and subjunctive events have in common that they are not directly anchored to the speech act, but anchored indirectly, to a higher verb, or, in case of modally marked forms, to another possible world. Indirect anchoring is thus what they have in common. The second anchoring mechanism to another possible world could be explored further in future work.

Moreover, there are more clause types that are potentially interesting to investigate in terms of finiteness, such as pseudo-coordination (Ledgeway 1997; 2016a; Andriani 2017:chap. 5; Di Caro 2018) and true imperatives. They have been excluded from the present dissertation for limitations of time and space. These are *a priori* finite-looking verbs, which however show properties of non-finite verbs (e.g. the coordinated verbs are interpreted as one event in the case pseudo-coordination; imperatives in many Romance varieties show enclisis like non-finite verbs and are restricted in their temporal and person interpretation as present and 2nd person). The

model for finiteness proposed in this dissertation could be tested against these clause types as well.

Another line of further research that would be interesting to pursue is to address the question of whether what has been discussed here for Romance extends to other language families as well, such as Germanic. Is the interaction between the anchoring mechanisms for tense and person Romance-specific? It has been argued that languages can differ in their main anchoring property (Ritter & Wiltschko 2014): this can be tense, as in Indo-European, but also person or location. It would be interesting to apply the current model to languages which do not have tense as their main anchoring category. The prediction would be that once a language combines two anchoring mechanisms, as in Romance, there will be several intermediate forms between fully finite (deictic) and non-finite (anchored via predicate valuation), irrespective of the (phono)morphological realisations of these anchoring mechanisms.

References

Adams, James N. 2005. The accusative + infinitive and dependent quod-/quia-clauses. In Sander Kiss, Luca Mondin & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Latin et langues romanes: Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire*, 195–206. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Adams, James N. 2011. Late Latin. In James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, 257–283. Oxford: Blackwell.

Adams, James N. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, James N. & Nigel Vincent. 2016. Infinitives with verbs of motion. In James N. Adams & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Early and Late Latin: continuity or change?*, 265–293. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adger, David. 2007. Three domains of finiteness: A minimalist perspective. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*, 23–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alboiu, Gabriela. 2006. Are we in agreement? In Cedric Boeckx (ed.), *Agreement systems*, 13–39. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Alboiu, Gabriela & Virginia Motapanyane. 2000. The generative approach to Romanian grammar: An overview. In Virginia Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative studies in Romanian syntax*, vol. North-Holland Linguistic Series, 1–48. Bingley: Emerald.

Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2002. Raising without infinitives and the role of agreement. In Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Dimensions of Movement*, 17–30. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordăchioaia & Mihaela Marchis. 2012. In Support of Long Distance Agree. In Artemis Alexiadou (ed.), *Local modelling of non-local dependencies in syntax* (Linguistische Arbeiten 547), 55–81. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Álvarez Blanco, Rosario, Henrique Monteagudo & Xosé Luis Regueira. 1986. *Gramática galega*. Vigo: Galaxia.

Ambar, Manuela. 1994. "Aux-to-COMP" and lexical restrictions on verb movement. In Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock & Raffaela Zanuttini (eds.), *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in honour of Richard S. Kayne*, 1–21. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ambar, Manuela. 1999. Infinitives vs. participles. In Esthela Trevino & José Lema (eds.), *Semantic issues in Romance Syntax: Proceedings of the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, 1996.*, 1–20. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Ambar, Manuela & Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández. 2014. Subjunctives: How Much Left Periphery Do You Need? In Ludmila Veselovská & Markéta Janebova (eds.), *Complex Visibles Out There. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language Use and Language Structure* (Olomouc Modern Language Series 4), 45–66. Olomouc: Palacky University.

Ambar, Manuela & Angel L. Jiménez-Fernández. 2017. Overtly/Non-overtly inflected infinitives in Romance. In Martin Bert Hans Everaert & van Riemsdijk Henk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companian to Syntax*, 1996–2037. second. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Amritavalli, R. 2014. Separating tense and finiteness: anchoring in Dravidian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32. 283–306. doi:10.1007/s11049-013-9219-3.

Anderson, John M. 2007. Finiteness, mood, and morphosyntax. *Journal of linguistics* 43(1). 1–32.

Anderson, Stephen. 2002. Syntax and morphology are different: Commentary on Jonas. In David Lightfood (ed.), *Syntactic effects on morphological change*, 271–5. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andriani, Luigi. 2017. *The syntax of the dialect of Bari*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Bailyn, John F. 1995. Underlying phrase structure and" short" verb movement in Russian. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 13–58.

Baños Baños, José. 2009. Subordinación completiva. In José Baños Baños (ed.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico*, 523–62. Madrid: Liceus.

Barron, Julia. 2000. The morphosyntactic correlates of finiteness. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG00 Conference*. University of California, Berkeley: CSLI Publications.

Baunaz, Lena. 2015. On the various sizes of complementizers. *Probus* 27(2). 193–236.

Baunaz, Lena & Eric Lander. 2018. Deconstructing categories syncretic with the nominal complementizer. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1).

Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized verb movement. Aspects of verb syntax*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2), 16–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Belletti, Adriana. 2005. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17(1). 1–35.

Belletti, Adriana. 2006. (Past) participle agreement. In Martin Bert Hans Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 3, 493–521. Oxford: Blackwell.

Belletti, Adriana. 2008. *Structures and strategies*. London: Routledge.

Benincà, Paola. 2001. The position of Topic and Focus in the left periphery. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 39–64. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In Raffaela Zanuttini, Hector Campos, Elena Herberger & Paul Portner (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, 53–86. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2), 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola & Christina Tortora. 2010. On clausal architecture: evidence from complement clitic placement in Romance. *Movement and Clitics: Adult and child grammar* 219–237.

Bentley, Delia. 2014. On the personal infinitive in Sicilian. In Paola Benincà, Adam N. Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, 96–115. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bernstein, Judy. 1991. DP's in French and Walloon: evidence for parametric variation in nominal head movement. *Probus* 3(2). 101–126.

Bertocci, Davide & Federico Damonte. 2007. Distribuzione e morfologia dei congiuntivi in alcune varietà salentine. In Federico Damonte & Jacopo Garzonio (eds.), *Studi sui dialetti della Puglia*, 3–28. Padua: Unipress.

Bertoni, Giulio. 1905. Intorno alle questioni sulla lingua della lirica italiana. *Studi Medievali* 1. 580–593.

Bertoni, Giulio. 1916. *Italia dialettale*. Milano: Hoepli.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2003. On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. In Jacqueline Guéron & Liliane Tasmowsky (eds.), *Temps et point de vue/Tense and point of view*, 213–246. Paris: Nanterre.

Biberauer, Mary Theresa & Ian Gareth Roberts. 2010. Subject, tense and verb movement in Germanic and Romance. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics (COPiL)* 3.

Biberauer, Mary Theresa, A. Holmberg & I. Roberts. 2014. A Syntactic Universal and Its Consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2). doi:10.1162/LING_a_00153. ://WOS:000335003000001.

Biberauer, Mary Theresa, Anders Holmberg & Ian Roberts. 2008. Disharmonic word-order systems and the Final-over-Final Constraint (FOFC). In A Bisetto, A Barbieri & F Barbieri (eds.).

Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo. 1988. *Le parlate dell'Alta Ogliastra. Analisi dialettologica. Saggio di storia linguistica e culturale.* (Studi di linguistica sarda 1). Cagliari: Edizioni della Torre.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2002. The rich agreement hypothesis in review. In Abe Yasuki (ed.), *Complex Predicates and Argument Structure*, 63–109. Nagoya: Nanzan University.

Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as movement.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Breban, Tine. 2014. What is secondary grammaticalization? Trying to see the wood for the trees in a confusion of interpretations. *Folia Linguistica* 48(2). 469–502.

Calabrese, Andrea. 1992. The lack of infinitival clauses in Salentino: A synchronic analysis. In Christiane Lauefer & Terrell A. Morgan (eds.), *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics. Selected Papers from the Nineteenth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XIX) The Ohio State University, 21-23 April 1989*, 267–267. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. The sentential complementation of Salentino: a study of a language without infinitival clauses. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, 28–98. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Towards a cartography of subject positions. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 2, 115–165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cecchetto, Carlo & Renato Oniga. 2002. Consequences of the analysis of Latin infinitival clauses for the theory of Case and control. *Lingue e linguaggio* 1(1). 151–0.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1982. An autosegmental theory of raddoppiamento. vol. 12, 49–62.

Chillà, Leonida & Cinzia Citraro. 2012. Impopolarità dell'infinito nelle varietà calabresi meridionali estreme: la selezione dei complementatori ei contesti modali. *Rivista italiana di linguistica e di dialettologia* 14(14). 113–144.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. Bare Phrase Structure. In Hector Campos & Paula Kempchinsky (eds.), *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory*, 51–109. Washington, DC: Georgetown U Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1998. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 15. 1–56.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 3), 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1993. The Theory of Principles and Parameters. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: Ein internationales handbuch zeitgenossischer forschung. An international handbook of contemporary research*, vol. 1, 506–69. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *The syntax of adverbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. Restructuring and functional structure. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond.* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 3), 132–191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.). 2006. *Restructuring and functional heads.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo & Luigi Rizzi. 2015. The cartography of syntactic structures. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, 67–78. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clackson, James & Geoffrey Horrocks. 2009. *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Colasanti, Valentina. 2018a. *Romance Morphosyntactic Microvariation in Complementizer and Auxiliary systems.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Colasanti, Valentina. 2018b. On Factivity: Speculations on the split-CP in Upper Southern Italian Dialects. *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 70–86.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Vol. 17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Costa, João. 2004. *Subject positions and interfaces: the case of European Portuguese*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cotfas, Maria Aurelia. 2014. Implicative verbs and their subjunctive complement in Romanian: obligatory control? In Manuela Burada & Oana Tatu (eds.), *10th conference on British and American studies - Crossing Borders*, 38–49. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cotfas, Maria Aurelia. 2016a. *On the syntax of the Romanian subjunctive*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Cotfas, Maria Aurelia. 2016b. Romanian Implicative Verbs Revisited: a încerca 'try' versus a reuși 'manage.' *Revue roumaine de linguistique* LXI(1). 29-51.

Cottell, Siobhán. 1995. The representation of tense in Modern Irish. *Geneva generative papers* 3. 105–124.

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2007. Deconstructing categories: finiteness in a functional-typological perspective. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Empirical and theoretical foundations*, 91–114. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, David. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 1994a. *Sull'origine della costruzione" dicere quod": aspetti sintattici e semantici*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 1994b. On sentential complementation after verba affectuum. In József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991)*, 201–10. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Da Luz, G. A. 1998. Inflected infinitive in Romance languages. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguisticos* 34. 7–17.

D'Alessandro, Roberta & Claudio Di Felice. 2015. The diachrony of Abruzzese complementation. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60. 129–145.

D'Alessandro, Roberta & Adam N. Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120(8). 2040–2060.

Damonte, Federico. 2009. La particella mu nei dialetti calabresi meridionali. In Diego Pescarini (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria* (Quaderni Di Lavoro ASIt), 101–117. Padova: Unipress.

Damonte, Federico. 2011. Matching Moods: Mood Concord between CP and IP in Salentino and Southern Calabrian Subjunctive Complements. In Paola Benincà & Nicola Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, 228–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Danckaert, Lieven. 2012. *Latin embedded clauses: the left periphery* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 184). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2013. *Strategie di complementazione frasale nell'estremo Meridione italiano*. Messina: SGB Edizioni.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2015. Between Greek and Romance: competing complementation systems in Southern Italy. Messina, ms.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2016. Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m), ma nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale. In Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba. (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6-8 novembre 2014)*, 75–94. Potenza: Il Segno Arti Grafiche.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. Microvariazione, diacronia e interferenza: due case-studies dall'Italia meridionale estrema.

De Dardel, Robert. 1983. *Esquisse structurale des subordonnants conjonctionnels en Roman commun*. Paris: Droz.

De Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo. 2007. If in doubt, leave it in: subject accusatives in Plautus and Terence. *Letras Clássicas* (11). 135–152.

De Roberto, Elisa. 2012. *Le costruzioni assolute nella storia dell'italiano*. Napoli: Loffredo Editore.

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2018. *Multiple agreement constructions in Southern Italo-Romance. The syntax of Sicilian pseudo-coordination*. Venice: Ca' Forscari University of Venice PhD thesis.

Dini, Luca. 1994. Aspectual constraints on Italian Absolute Phrases. *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 8. 52–87.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of Romanian: Comparative studies in Romance*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993. *A grammar of Afrikaans*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dragomirescu, Adina. 2011. The subject of the supine clause in Romanian and A-chains. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 56. 4.371-392.

Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2016. On the origin of inflected "non-finite" forms: the infinitive vs. the supine. *Diacronia* 4. 1–18. doi:10.17684/i4A54en.

Dubert, Francisco & Charlotte Galves. 2016. Galician and Portuguese. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 411–446. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The verbal complex V′-V in French. *Linguistic inquiry* 9. 151–175.

Enç, Mürvet. 1987. Anchoring conditions for tense. *Linguistic inquiry* 633–657.

Engver, Karl. 1972. *Place de l'adverbe déterminant un infinitif dans la prose du français contemporain* (Studia Romanica Upsaliensia 7). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Ernout, Alfred & François Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Fanciullo, Franco. 1986. Syntactic reduplication and the Italian dialects of the Centre-South. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 8(67–104).

Farkas, Donka. 1991. On obviation. In Ivan A. Sag & Anna Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical Matters*, 85–109. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fernández-Salgueiro, Gerardo. 2008. The Case-F valuation parameter in Romance. In Mary Theresa Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 132), 295–310. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fernández-Sánchez, Javier. 2016. Topics at the left edge of infinitive clauses in Spanish and Catalan. *Borealis–An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 5(2). 111–134.

Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential pro. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25(4). 691–734.

Frîncu, Constantin. 1969. Cu privire la 'uniunea lingvistică balcanică'. Înlocuirea infinitivului prin construcţii personale în limba română veche. *Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară* 20. 69–116.

Gallego, Ángel J. 2010. *Phase theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gallego, Ángel J. 2015. Subjunctive dependents in Iberian Romance: A Reprojection account. *Sintagma: revista de lingüística* 25–42.

Gelderen, van, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as economy* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 71). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Gelderen,van, Elly. 2009. Renewal in the left periphery: economy and the complementizer layer. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107(2). 131–195.

Gelderen, van, Elly. 2015. The particle how. In Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl & Andreas Trotzke (eds.), *Discourse-oriented Syntax* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 226), 159–174. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Gheorghe, Mihaela, Andreea Dinică, Rodica Zafiu, Oana Uță Bărbulescu & Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. 2016. The complex clause. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The syntax of Old Romanian*, 463–561. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giorgi, Alessandra. 1984. Toward a theory of long distance anaphors: a GB approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3(4). 307–362.

Giorgi, Alessandra. 2010. *About the speaker. Towards a syntax of indexality* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giorgi, Alessandra & Fabio Pianesi. 1996. Verb movement in Italian and syncretic categories. *Probus* 8(2). 137–160.

Giorgi, Alessandra & Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: Form Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction.* Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Godefroy, Frédéric. 1982. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX au VI siècle*. Vol. 6. 10 vols. Geneva-Paris.

Gondar, Francisco G. 1978. *O infinitivo conxugado en galego*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

Grano, Thomas. 2015. *Control and restructuring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greco, Paolo. 2008. *Accusativus cum Infinitivo e subordinate completive con quod, quia e quoniam in alcune cronache latine dell'Italia centro-meridionale (secoli X-XII)*. Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II.

Groothuis, Kim A. 2015. *The inflected infinitive in Romance*. Leiden University Research master thesis. https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/34426.

Groothuis, Kim A. 2016. Control with Sardinian inflected infinitives. Presented at the SUM 2016, Brașov.

Groothuis, Kim A. 2019. Postverbal subject positions in 'semi-finite' clauses in Southern Italo-Romance and Sardinian. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2016. Selected papers from "Going Romance" Frankfurt 2016* (Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 15), 220-236. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grosu, Alexander & Julia Horvath. 1984. The GB theory and raising in Rumanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 348–353.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind & Language* 18(4). 317–339.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses. *Folia linguistica* 41(3–4). 279–325.

Haegeman, Liliane M.V. 2010. The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120(3). 628–648.

Haegeman, Liliane M.V. & Barbara Ürögdi. 2010a. Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. *Theoretical linguistics* 36(2–3). 111–152.

Haegeman, Liliane M.V. & Barbara Ürögdi. 2010b. Operator movement, referentiality and intervention. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36(2–3). 233–246.

Haegeman, Liliane M.V. & Marjo Van Koppen. 2012. Complementizer agreement and the relation between C0 and T0. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3). 441–454.

Hale, Kenneth. 1986. Notes on world view and semantic categories: Some Warlpiri examples. (Ed.) Pieter C Muysken & Henk Riemsdijk, van. *Features and projections* 233–254.

Harbert, Wayne. 2006. *The Germanic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, Alice C & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1989. From Purposive To Infinitive—A Universal Path Of Grammaticization. *Folia linguistica historica* 23(Historica vol. 10, 1-2). 287–310.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2007. *The genesis of grammar: a reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herman, József. 1963. *La formation du système roman des conjonctions de subordination*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Herman, József. 1989. Accusativus cum infinitivo et subordonnée à quod, quia en Latin tardif-Nouvelles remarques sur un vieux problème. In Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquiumon Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, 133–152. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herman, József. 2000. *Vulgar Latin*. (Trans.) Roger Wright. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press.

Hernanz, Maria-Lluïsa. 1999. El infinitivo. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 2, 2197–2356. Madrid: Editorial Espasa Calpe.

Hill, Virginia. 2013. The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive. *The linguistic review* 30(4). 1–37.

Hofmann, Johann Baptist & Anton Szantyr. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik: mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik*. Vol. 2. Munich: Beck.

Holmberg, Anders. 2015. Verb second. In Artemis Alexiadou & Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*, 342–383. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hooper, Joan B. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic inquiry* 4(4). 465–497.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. second. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic inquiry* 30(1). 69–96.

Hornstein, Norbert & Itziar San Martin. 2013. Obviation as anti-control. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca" Julio de Urquijo"* 35(1). 367–384.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2011. Latin syntax. In James Clackson (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 118–143. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hualde, José Ignacio. 1992. *Catalan*. London: Routledge.

Institut d'Estudis Catalans. 2016. *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

Jøhndal, Marius L. 2012. *Non-finiteness in Latin*. University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Jones, Michael Allan. 1992. Infinitives with specified subjects in Sardinian. In Christiane Lauefer & James Morgan (eds.), *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XIX, Ohio State University, April 21 23, 1989*, 295–309. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jones, Michael Allan. 1993. *Sardinian syntax*. London: Routledge.

Jones, Michael Allan. 1997. Sardinia. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*, 376–84. London: Routledge.

Jordan, Maria. 2009. *Loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian diachronic syntax*. University of Florida PhD thesis.

Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kayne, Richard S. 1991. Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(4). 647–686.

Kayne, Richard S. 1999. Prepositional Complementizers as Attractors. *Probus* 11(1). 39–73.

Kempchinsky, Paula. 1987. The subjunctive disjoint reference effect. In Carol Neidle & Rafael A. Nuñez Cedeño (eds.), *Studies in Romance languages*, vol. 25, 123–140. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kempchinsky, Paula. 2009. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua* 119(12). 1788–1810. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.009.

Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1968. Fact. In L. Jakobovits & Danny D. Steinberg (eds.), *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, 345–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, Wolfgang. 1998. Assertion and finiteness. *Issues in the theory of language acquisition: Essays in honor of Jürgen Weissenborn*, 225–245. Peter Lang.

Klein, Wolfgang. 2006. On finiteness. In Veerle van Veenhoven (ed.), *Semantics in acquisition* (Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics), 245–272. Springer.

Koeneman, Olaf. 2001. *The flexible nature of verb movement*. Groningen University.

Koeneman, Olaf & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. The rich agreement hypothesis rehabilitated. *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Koopman, Hilda Judith. 1984. *The syntax of verbs: From verb movement rules in the Kru languages to Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1986. A note on long extraction in Vata and the ECP. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4(3). 357–374.

Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85(2). 211–258.

Koppen, Marjo van. 2017. Complementizer agreement. In Martin Bert Hans Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. II, 923–962. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalizations*. London: Routledge.

Laka, Itziar. 1992. Negative complementizers: evidence from English, Basque and Spanish. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca" Julio de Urquijo"* 175–211.

Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(3). 471–498.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(4). 811–877.

Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 71). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lasser, Ingeborg. 2002. The roots of root infinitives: remarks on infinitival main clauses in adult and child language. *Linguistics* 40(4; ISSU 380). 767–796.

Lausberg, Heinrich. 1939. *Die Mundarten Südlukaniens*. Niemeyer: Halle.

Ledgeway, Adam N. in press. The syntactic distribution of raddoppiamento fonosinttatico in Cosentino: A phase-theoretic account. In Adina Dragomirescu & Alexandru Nicolae (eds.), *Romance Language and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 1997. Asyndetic complementation in Neapolitan dialect. *The Italianist* 17(1). 231–273.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 1998. Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of the Southern Calabrian inflected infinitive. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96(1). 1–61.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2000. *A comparative syntax of the dialects of Southern Italy: a minimalist approach*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 27. 89–147.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy. *Transactions of the philological society* 103(3). 339–396.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2006. The Dual Complementiser System in Southern Italy: Spirito greco, materia romanza? In Anna Laura Lepschy & Arturo Tosi (eds.), *Rethinking languages in contact: The case of Italian.*, 112–26. Oxford: Legenda.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2007. Diachrony and finiteness: subordination in the dialects of Southern Italy. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 335–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2009a. *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano* (Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Romanische Philologie 350). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2009b. Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino. In Diego Pescarini (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria* (Quaderni Di Lavoro ASIt 9), 3–24. Padua: Unipress.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2012a. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2012b. Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento. (Ed.) Marina Benedetti. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 41(3). 459–480.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2012c. La sopravvivenza del sistema dei doppi complementatori nei dialetti meridionali. In Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), *Dialetti: Per Parlare e Per Parlarne. Atti del II Convegno internazionale di dialettologia - Progetto A.L.Ba*, 151–76. Rionero in Vulture: Calice editore.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2013. Greek disguised as Romance? The case of Southern Italy. In Mark Janse, Brian D Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bagriacik (eds.), *MGDLT5. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 184–227. Patras: Laboratory of Greek dialects, University of Patras.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2015a. Reconstructing Complementiser-drop in the Dialects of the Salento: A Syntactic or Phonological Phenomenon? In Mary Theresa Biberauer & George Walkenden (eds.), *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*, 146–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2015b. Parallels in Romance Nominal and Clausal Microvariation. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* LX(2–3). 105–127.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2016a. From Coordination to Subordination: The Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the dialects of Salento. In A. Cardoso, Ana Maria Martins, Sandra Pereira, C. Pinto & F. Pratas (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination*, 157–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2016b. Clausal Complementation. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013–1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2016c. Minunile limbii române: Lecții pentru romaniști. Bucharest.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2016d. The Dialects of Southern Italy. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 246–69. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. 2017. Late Latin Verb Second: The Sentential Word Order of the "Itinerarium Egeriae." (Ed.) Jaume Mateu & Renato Oniga. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 16. 163–216.

Ledgeway, Adam N. & Alessandra Lombardi. 2005. Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance. *Probus* 17(1). 79–113.

Ledgeway, Adam N. & Alessandra Lombardi. 2014. The development of the southern subjunctive: morphological loss and syntactic gain. In Paola Benincà, Adam N. Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy.*, 25–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam N. & Ian G. Roberts. forthcoming. the VP. *The syntax of Italian*.

Legate, Julie Anne. 2010. On how how is used instead of that. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28(1). 121–134.

Leone, Alfonso. 1995. *Profilo di sintassi siciliana* (Materiali e Ricerche Dell'Atlante Linguistico Della Sicilia 3). Palermo: Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Lateinische Sprache*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Lombardi, Alessandra. 1998. Calabria greca e Calabria latina da Rohlfs ai giorni nostri: la sintassi dei verbi modali-aspettuali. *Calabria greca e Calabria latina da Rohlfs ai giorni nostri: la sintassi dei verbi modali-aspettuali* (Sintassi Storica. Atti del XXX Congresso della Società di Linguistica Italiana). Rome: Bulzoni.

Longa, Víctor Manuel. 1994. The Galician inflected infinitive and the theory of UG. *Catalan working papers in linguistics* 4. 023–044.

Loporcaro, Michele. 1986. L'infinito coniugato nell'Italia centro-meridionale: ipotesi genetica e ricostruzione storica. *L'Italia dialettale* 49. 609–65.

Loporcaro, Michele. 1997a. Puglia and Salento. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*, 338–348. London: Routledge.

Loporcaro, Michele. 1997b. *L'origine del raddoppiamento fonosintattico: saggio di fonologia diacronica romanza*. Basel: Francke.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2003. The Unaccusative Hypothesis and participial absolutes in Italian. Perlmutter's generalization revised. *Rivista di Linguistica/Italian Journal of Linguistics* 15. 199–263.

Loporcaro, Michele & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2011. Vocalismo finale atono e morfosintassi dell'accordo participiale in due varietà generazionali del dialetto di Verbicaro (provincia di Cosenza). *Revue de linguistique romane*.

Madeira, Ana Maria. 1994. On the Portuguese inflected infinitive. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 6. 179–203.

Maiden, Martin. 1995. *A linguistic history of Italian*. London: Longman.

Maiden, Martin. 2016. Romanian. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 91–125. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mancarella, Giovan Battista (ed.). 1998. *Salento: monografia regionale della "Carta dei dialetti italiani."* Lecce: Del Grifo.

Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. *Grammatical categories. Variation in Romance languages* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: morfosintassi generativa*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzotti, E. & A. Rigamonti. 2001. La negazione. In Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi & Anna Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol. 2: I sintagmi verbale, aggettivale, avverbaile; la subordinazione, 245–317. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Martín Puente, Cristina. 2009. Condicionales y concesivas. In José Baños Baños (ed.), *Síntaxis del Latín clásico*, 657–678. Madrid: Liceus.

Martin, Roger. 2001. Null case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic inquiry* 32(1). 141–166.

Martins, Ana Maria. 2001. On the origin of the Portuguese inflected infinitive. In Laurel Brinton (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1999: Selected Papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9-13 August 1999*, 207–222. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31(4). 829–865.

Matthews, Peter. 2007. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maurer, Theodoro Henrique. 1968. *O infinito flexionado português: estudo histórico-descritivo*. São Paulo: Editora Nacional.

Meillet, Antoine. 1912. *L'évolution des formes grammaticales*. Nicola Zanichelli.

Meireles, José & Eduardo Raposo. 1983. Subjunctives and disjoint reference in Portuguese: Some implications for the Binding Theory. *Comunicação apresentada ao I er Col. loqui Internacional de Lingüistica Teòrica i Llengues Romàniques. Sitges.*

Mensching, Guido. 2000. *Infinitive constructions with specified subjects: A syntactic analysis of the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1899. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*. Vol. III. Syntax. Leipzig: Reisland.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1902. Zur Kenntnis des altlogudoresischen.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Munaro, Nicola. 2016. Il raddoppiamento del complementatore nelle varietà italo-romanze in prospettiva diacronica. (Ed.) Jacopo Garzonio & Silvia Rossi. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 19. 89–104.

Narrog, Heiko & Bernd Heine. 2017. Grammaticalization. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), 7–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781107279070.002.

Nedelcu, Isabela Mihaela, Adina Dragomirescu, Dana Niculescu & Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. 2016. Non-finite verb forms and non-finite constructions. *The syntax of Old Romanian*, 232–287. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neeleman, Ad & Hans Van de Koot. 2006. Syntactic haplology. In Martin Bert Hans Everaert & van Riemsdijk Henk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 685–710. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituentilor in limba română: o perspectivá diacronică. Structura propozitiei si deplasarea verbului.* Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2016. Romanian modal verbs: modals and phases.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2017. Fundamental Morphosyntactic Structures of Romanian. Cambridge.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2019. *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian. A Comparative Romance Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina A. 2007a. Introduction. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 1–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina A. 2007b. Constructional Economy and nonfinite independent clauses. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 138–180. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina A. 2010. Typology of finiteness. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(12). 1176–1189.

Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 2, 52–150. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neill, Teresa. 2015. *The domain of Finiteness. Anchoring without Tense in copular amalgam sentences*. New York: The City University of New York PhD thesis.

Ouali, Hamid. 2008. On C-to-T-feature transfer: the nature of agreement and anti-agreement in Berber. In Roberta D'Alessandro, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Susann Fischer (eds.), *Agreement Restrictions*, 159–180. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 1986. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2013a. Non-finite verb forms and non-finite clauses. The infinitive. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 211–222. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2013b. Non-finite verb forms and non-finite clauses. The Participle. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 222–233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2013c. Non-finite verb forms and non-finite clauses. The supine. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 233–245. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paoli, Sandra. 2003. *COMP and the left-periphery: Comparative evidence from Romance*. University of Manchester.

Parafita Couto, Maria del Carmen. 2002. *Minimalist Approach to Galician Inflected Infinitives*. University of Kansas.

Perlmutter, David M. 1989. Multiattachment and the unaccusative hypothesis: the perfect auxiliary in Italian. *Probus* 1(1). 63–120.

Picallo, M. Carme. 1984a. Opaque domains. *Linguistic review* 4(3). 279–288.

Picallo, M. Carme. 1984b. The Infl node and the null subject parameter. *Linguistic inquiry* 75–102.

Pinkster, Harm. 1990. *Latin syntax and semantics*. London: Routledge.

Pires, Acrisio. 2002. Cue-based change: Inflection and subjects in the history of Portuguese infinitives. In David Lightfood (ed.), *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, 143–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pires, Acrisio. 2006. *The minimalist syntax of defective domains: Gerunds and infinitives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Pisano, Simone. 2008. L'infinito flesso in alcune varietà sarde moderne: coincidenza formale con l'imperfetto congiuntivo etimologico? *Bollettino linguistico campano* 13(1/2). 25–48.

Pittau, Massimo. 1972. *Grammatica del sardo-nuorese: il più conservativo dei parlari neolatini*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Platzack, Christer. 1986. COMP, INFL, and Germanic word order. In Lars Hellan & Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*, 185–234. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The higher functional field: Evidence from northern Italian dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2001. Complementiser Deletion and Verb Movement in Italian. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 265–86. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic inquiry* 20. 365–424.

Postal, Paul. 1971. *Crossover phenomena*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Pountain, Christopher J. 1995. Infinitives with overt subjects: a pragmatic approach. In T. Earle & N. Griffin (eds.), *Portuguese, Brazilian and African Studies: studies presented to Clive Willis on his retirement*, 11–25. Warminster: Aris and Philips.

Pristerà, Paolo. 1987. Per la definizione dell'isoglossa ca/mu nei dialetti calabresi mediani. *Quaderni del dipartimento di linguistica, Università della Calabria* 2. 137–147.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Subjunctive: the (mis) behavior of anaphora and negative polarity. *The Linguistic Review* 10(1). 37–60.

Rand, E.K. & O. Hey. 1906. Eine Predigt über Christi Höllenfahrt. *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* 14. 253–65.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1986. Some asymmetries in the binding theory in Romance. *The Linguistic Review* 5(1). 75–110.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic inquiry* 18. 85–109.

Raposo, Eduardo P & Juan Uriagereka. 2005. Clitic placement in Western Iberian: a Minimalist view. In Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, 639–697. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Repetti, Lori. 1991. A moraic analysis of raddoppiamento fonosintattico. *Rivista di linguistica* 3(2). 307–330.

Rigau, Gemma. 1995. The properties of the temporal infinitive constructions in Catalan and Spanish. *Probus* 7(3). 279–302.

Ritter, Elizabeth & Martina Wiltschko. 2014. The composition of INFL. An exploration of tense, tenseless languages and tenseless constructions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32. 1331–1386.

Rivero, Maria Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12(1). 63–120.

Rivero, María-Luisa & Angela Ralli. 2001. Introduction. In Maria Luisa Rivero & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax), 3–16. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1976a. La montée du sujet, le si impersonnel et une règle de restructuration dans la syntaxe italienne. *Recherches linguistiques* 4. 158–184.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1976b. Ristrutturazione. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 1(1). 1–54.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1978. A restructuring rule in Italian syntax. In Samuel Jay Keyser (ed.), *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, 113–158. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position "Int (errogative)" in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 287–96. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. On the cartography of syntactic structures. *The structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2), 3–15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi & Giuliano Bocci. 2017. Left periphery of the clause. Primarily illustrated for Italian. In Martin Bert Hans Everaert & Henk Riemsdijk, van (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 1–30. 2nd edn. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Roberts, Ian G. 1985. Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 3(1). 21–58.

Roberts, Ian G. 1993. *Verbs and diachronic syntax: A comparative history of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roberts, Ian G. 1999. Verb movement and markedness. In Michel DeGraff (ed.), *Language creation and change.*, 287–328. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: Clitics, incorporation, and defective goals* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs). Vol. 59. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 2016. Object clitics. *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 86–801. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 2019. *Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian G. & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodrigues, Cilene. 2002. Morphology and null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese In Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change. In David Lightfood (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, 160–78. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1966. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 1: Fonetica. Turin: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1968. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 2: Morfologia. Turin: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole. Turin: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1972. *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d'Italia*. Firenze: Sansoni.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1983. Distinzione di due congiunzioni in dialetti d'Italia. In Paola Benincà, Manlio Cortelazzo, Aldo Prosdocimi, Laura Vanelli & Alberto Zamboni (eds.), *Studi in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, 147–154. Pisa: Pacini.

Rohrbacher, Bernhard Wolfgang. 1999. *Morphology-driven syntax: A theory of V to I raising and pro-drop*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rooryck, Johan. 2000. *Configurations of sentential complementation. Perspectives from Romance Languages*. London/New York: Routledge.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1962. *Istoria limbii romîne*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii populare Romîne.

Roussou, Anna. 2001. Control and Raising in and out of Subjunctive Complements. In Maria-Luisa Rivera & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rowlett, Paul. 2007. *The syntax of French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2005. Some firm points on Latin word order: The left periphery. In Katalin É Kiss (ed.), *Universal Grammar in the reconstruction of ancient languages*, 429–56. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Sandfeld, Kristian & Hedvig Olsen. 1962. *Syntaxe roumaine*. Vol. III. Structure de la proposition. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Schifano, Norma. 2015. *Verb-movement: a pan-Romance investigation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Schifano, Norma. 2018. *Verb movement in Romance. A comparative study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmitt, Cristina. 1998. Lack of iteration: Accusative clitic doubling, participial absolutes and have+ agreeing participles. *Probus* 10(3). 243–300.

Scida, Emily E. 2004. *The Inflected Infinitive in Romance Languages*. London: Routledge.

Sells, Peter. 2007. Finiteness in non-transformational syntactic frameworks. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 59–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sgrilli, Paola. 1984. *Il "Libro di Sidrac" salentino. Edizione, spoglio linguistico e lessico*. Pisa: Pacini.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2013. Portuguese, Russian and the Theory of Control. In H. Huang, E. Poole & A. Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society 43 (NELS 43)*, vol. 2, 115–126.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2014. Partial Control in Romance Languages: the Covert Comitative Analysis. In K. Lahousse & S. Marzo (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, 181–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2016. Complex predicates. *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. Control of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. In Anabela Gonçalves & A.-L. Santos (eds.), *Complement clauses in Portuguese: syntax and acquisition*, 27–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sheehan, Michelle, Theresa Biberauer, Ian Roberts & Anders Holmberg. 2017. *The final-over-final condition: A syntactic universal*. Vol. 76. MIT Press.

Sheehan, Michelle, Jeffrey Blokzijl & Maria del Carmen Parafita Couto. Inflected infinitives in Galician.

Sheehan, Michelle & Sonia Cyrino. to appear. Why do some ECM verbs resist passivisation: a phase-based explanation. *Proceedings of NELS* 48.

Sheehan, Michelle & Wolfram Hinzen. 2011. Moving towards the edge. *Linguistic Analysis* 37(3–4). 405–458.

Sheehan, Michelle Louise. 2007. *The EPP and null subjects in Romance*. University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2002. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of Romance Infinitives with Nominative Subjects*. University of Manchester.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2007. Romance infinitives with subject, subjunctive obviation and control theory. In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, modality and focus: studies on the syntax-semantics interface* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 111). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Skytte, Giampaolo Salvi & Maria Rita Manzini. 2001. Frasi subordinate all'infinito. In Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi & Anna Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande grammatica di consultazione*, vol. 2, 483–569. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Smith, John Charles. 2016. French and northern Gallo-Romance. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 292–318. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorrento, Luigi. 1951. *Sintassi romanza: ricerche e prospettive*. 2nd edn. Varese-Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino.

Spyropoulos, Vassilios. 2007. Finiteness and control in Greek. *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, 159–183. Springer.

Squillaci, Maria-Olimpia. 2016. *When Greek meets Romance: a morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Stan, Camelia. 2007. Notă gramaticală: „conjuncţia" ca (…) să. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 2.

Stassen, Leon. 1985. *Languistic universals and comparison*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stowell, Tim. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic inquiry* 13(3). 561–570.

Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1980. *On the Nominative Island Condition, Vacuous Application and the'that'-trace Filter*. Indiana univ. linguistics club.

Taylor, Cameron. 2014. *Aspects of clause structure in Nicotrese. A descriptive account*. University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Tekavčić, Pavao. 1980. *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Vol. 2: Morfosintassi. Bologna: Il mulino.

Terzi, Arhonto. 1996. Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising. *Probus* 8(3). 273–295.

Terzi, Arhonto. 1997. PRO and null case in finite clauses. *The Linguistic Review* 14(4). 335–360.

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2012. *On verb movement in Brazilian Portuguese: a cartography study*. Venice: Ca' Foscari University of Venice PhD thesis.

Todorović, Neda & Susi Wurmbrand. 2016. Finiteness across domains. *Selected proceedings from Formal description of Slavic Languages*.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 67). Dordrecht: Springer.

Torrego, Esther. 1998. Nominative subjects and pro-drop INFL. *Syntax* 1(2). 206–219.

Tortora, Christina. 2010. Domains of clitic placement in finite and non-finite clauses: Evidence from a Piedmontese dialect. In Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway & Ian G. Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy.*, 135–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tortora, Christina. 2014. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trask, Robert Lawrence. 1993. *A dictionary of grammatical terms*. London: Routledge.

Tsoulas, George. 1996. The nature of subjunctive and the formal grammar of obviation. In Karen Zagona (ed.), *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages: Selected papers from the 25th linguistics symposium on Romance languages (LSRL XXV) Seattle, 2-4 March 1995* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 133), 293–306. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic inquiry* 26. 79–123.

Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 1996. Subjunctive of Negation and [Neg (ative)] Complementizers. In Karen Zagona (ed.), *Grammatical Theory and the Romance Languages* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series 4), 307–316. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Usonienė, Aurelija & Nigel Vincent. 2018. Non-finiteness, Complementation and Evidentiality: the Lithuanian Accusativus cum Participio in a Cross-linguistic Perspective. In Dalila Ayoun, Agnès Celle & Laure Lansari (eds.), *Tense, Aspect, Modality and Evidentiality. Crosslinguistic Perspectives*, 239–260. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Väänänen, Veikko. 1963. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. 3rd edn. Paris: Klincksieck.

Vecchio, Paola. 2010. The distribution of the complementizers /ka/ and /ku/ in the north Salentino dialect of Francavilla Fontana (Brindisi). In Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam N. Ledgeway & Ian G. Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, 312–322. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vincent, Nigel. 1988. Latin. In Martin B Harris & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *The Romance Languages*, 26–78. London: Routledge.

Vincent, Nigel. 1993. Head-versus dependent-marking: the case of the clause. In Greville G Corbett, Norma Fraser & Scott McGlashan (eds.), *Heads in grammatical theory*, 140–163. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vincent, Nigel. 1996. L'infinito flesso in un testo napoletano del Trecento. In Paola Benincà, Guglielmo Cinque, Tullio De Mauro & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Italiano e dialetto nel tempo: saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*, 389–409. Rome: Bulzoni.

Vincent, Nigel. 1998. On the grammar of inflected non-finite forms (with special reference to Old Neapolitan). *Copenhagen studies in language* 22. 135–158.

Virdis, Maurizio. 2015. Le proposizioni infinitive in sardo. In Maria Grazia Busà & Sara Gesuato (eds.), *Lingue e contesti. Studi in onore di Alberto M. Mioni*. Padova: CLEUP.

Watanabe, Akira. 1996. *Case absorption and wh-agreement*. Vol. 37. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wexler, Ken. 1994. Optional Infinitives, Head Movement and the Economy of Derivations. In David Lightfoot & Norbert Hornstein (eds.), *Verb movement*, 305–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wheeler, Max, Alan Yates & Nicolau Dols. 1999. *Catalan: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routlegde.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10(3). 203–233.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic inquiry* 11(1). 203–238.

Willis, David. 2007. Specifier-to-head reanalyses in the complementizer domain: evidence from Welsh. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105(3). 432–480.

Willis, David. 2017. Degrammaticalization. In Adam N. Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), 28–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfe, Sam. 2015. *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge PhD thesis.

Wolfe, Sam. 2019. *Verb Second in Medieval Romance* (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, Roger. 2011. The Romance languages as source for spoken Latin. In James Clackson (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 59–79. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2007. Infinitives are tenseless. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 13(1). 407–420.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2014. Tense and aspect in English infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3). 403–447.

Wurmbrand, Susanne & Magdalena Lohninger. submitted. An implicational universal in complementation: Theoretical insights and empirical progress. In Jutta M Hartmann & Angelika Wöllstein (eds.), *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Yates, Alan. 1975. *Catalan*. Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2013a. Mood, tense, and aspect. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 24–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2013b. Information structure. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Grammar of Romanian*, 568–575. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zafiu, Rodica, Alexandru Nicolae, Dana Niculescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Irina Nicula Paraschiv, Adina Dragomirescu & Andra Vasilescu. 2016. The verb and its arguments: the root clause. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The syntax of Old Romanian*, 14–231. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zagona, Karen. 2002. *The syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997a. *Negation and clausal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997b. Negation and verb movement. In Liliane MV Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*, 214–245. London/New York: Longman.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2012. There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29(3). 491 – 539.